The re-generation of thought occasioned by the October Revolution in Pakistan under the leadership of the soldier-scholar, President Muhammad Ayub Khan, gave rise to no more striking and thought-provoking articles than those of Al Hamza who wrote copiously on such diverse problems as the Five-Year Plans, the status of English in Pakistan, the Islamic ideology, Basic democracies, Values and National destiny and the like. Al Hamza's writings were quoted and discussed in both the Western and Eastern halves of the world.

D

Post-Revolution

PAKISTANI THEMES

By

AL HAMZA

1961

Published by :
THE PROGRESSIVE PAPERS LTD.
LAHORE

PRINTED AT
THE PAKISTAN TIMES PRESS
LAHORE

To

FIELD MARSHAL

MUHAMMAD AYUB KHAN

SOLDIER, SCHOLAR AND STATESMAN

PRESIDENT OF PAKISTAN

who

In order that his people and his country may live, sent to the Pakistan Writers' Guild the following memorable exhortation :

> *"Feel free in your mind, act freely in your expression and react freely to the environment around you. Let not the edge of your sensitivity be blunted by any sense of fear or expediency. On my behalf I cannot do better than assure you in the spirit of Voltaire, that I may differ, even protest, against what you say, but I will defend your right to say it unless it is directed against the very existence of our homeland."*

CONTENTS

An Ideology for Pakistan

(*December, 1958*)

Every thinking person who lives in Pakistan is aware of the problems that face this country today. Some of these problems are of vast magnitude and complexity. They have been raised by various internal and external forces some of which are fraught with grave dangers to our security and welfare. When one contemplates the darker possibilities inherent in our position today, one is likely to be filled with deep concern. Unless we can, by the most careful national organisation and ceaseless hard work, mobilise our human and material resources which are truly great, our very existence could be imperilled.

No appraisal of our present situation would be complete if it did not take into account the magnificent assets that we hold as a sovereign state. There are immense resources of faith and spirit with the people of Pakistan. The events of the last half century have shown that these resources of the spirit are accompanied by their concomitants of courage and steadfastness in the face of all earthly odds. It is no undue optimism to say that with the grace of God, the people of Pakistan will win through to prosperity and security within the not too distant future.

Pakistan came into existence as a result of the urge of its people towards freedom and prosperity consciously realised by them in terms of Islamic principles. Islam presents to mankind the vision of human dignity which is so universal that all progress so far achieved is consistent with Islamic ideals. Justice between man and man, the grace and beauty of family ties,

the rights and freedoms which are inalienable from human status as well as the obligations of the individual towards society, have for ever been guaranteed by the canons of Islam.

By far the largest majority of our countrymen find in the Islamic concepts of justice, equity and deceney the sheet anchor of their efforts towards a properly integrated life. Their faith in the tenets of Islam is the principle source of motivation in their fight for right against wrong. This is the most important force that binds the people of Pakistan into an orderly and peaceful society today. It would be generally agreed that the softening of our social structure has been most marked in those parts where the concepts of equity, justice and human dignity have been obscured by the un-Islamic impulses of selfishness, vanity and dishonest acquisitiveness.

Thus the ideology of Islam lies in the background of all national effort in this country. It constitutes the spiritual guarantee of our survival in the struggle that lies ahead of us. Without moral direction, an aggregate of human beings is a chaos, and their operational potential is greatly lowered for some are constantly at cross-purposes with the others. To take a simple example, a community made up of thieves and their victims can never measure up against an equal number of honest men who, respecting each other's rights, can present a united front to all challenges. With a strong sense of moral direction, a people have the discipline and striking power of a trained army and this factor lends them preponderant superiority in the struggle for survival.

There will be an air of unreality in our profession of Islamic principles if we lose sight of the needs of modernity. Conditions of life in the

modern era confront us with stresses and strains the like of which has never been known in history. Islam was given to mankind for their spiritual and material salvation. There are several spiritual systems which lay down that by losing this world we gain the other. As far as I am able to understand it, Islam is very different from such systems. In fact, keeping the spirit of Islam in view, one might say that ascetic practices and a wilful denial of the natural offices of life are not likely to bring a person spiritual salvation. This world is very much the scene of human activity and Islam enjoins upon us to excel in right achievement during the term of our existence upon this planet.

It cannot therefore be imagined that Islam should be a hurdle in the path of achievement in this age of nuclear energy and space travel. In fact, as has already been said, the moral direction provided by Islam should weld our nation into a powerful operational force in both peace and war. So, an individual Muslim, when confronted with modern situations for which no precedent exists in the past, should keep the spirit of Islam in view in moulding his conduct.

Nations have more to do with each other as time and distance shrink before improved means of communication and travel. The western concept of nationalism which divides people on the mechanical bases of race, language and territory is fast becoming obsolete, and the aggravated form of this nationalism when evinced by a territorial group, is likely to spell danger to the peace of the world. Here again the Islamic approach with its universal standards of right and wrong would be of inestimable value in the international sphere. In this context, the time-honoured concept of a universal Omnipotence transcending all material

symbols, or as the Quran says, "a God of the Worlds," is a foundational term of reference for establishing mutual understanding and just dealings between all mankind.

It would, therefore, be in the fitness of things to designate this country an Islamic state. This is not to say that we should make Pakistan a theocratic state. A country can become a theocracy only when all of its citizens profess only one religion, and in the pale of that religion, own only one kind of theology. The citizens of Pakistan belong to different religious denominations, and each religion has its different sects with marked theological variations. The State cannot take upon itself the task of making any of its citizens conform to any set of theological practices. On the other hand it is one of the chief functions of the Government to defend the right of every citizen to live his religious life according to his own convictions. In so doing the government cannot permit the persecution of any person by any individual or group for follwing the tenets of his faith. Of course, unethical and immoral acts should not be allowed to pass under the cover of religion.

Anyone who thinks it is worthwhile to have insincere and unconvinced subscribers to a creed by subjecting them to coercion must be a bigot and a fanatic. The Quran lays down that there can be no coercion in the matter of religious belief, and in the Islamic State of Pakistan there should be no room for bigotry and fanatical intolerance.

While the government of a state should be concerned with the moral and not the dogmatic aspect of religion, it will be useful to refer to the

immutable basis on which the entire structure of Islamic philosophy is built.

The Islamic concept of God is symbolic of the unity of purpose in the universe and provides the most perfect basis for law and order in human relationships. The postulates of Human Rights and Human Dignity are moral and not scientific concepts. Scientific evolution can justify the biological principle of struggle but not the moral and ethical principles of mutual obligation among men. All our ideas of justice, fair-play, humanity and charity are referable to a Grand Purpose which is symbolised in a Just and Beneficent God who is omni-present and omni-potent and has neither beginning nor end. It can thus be said that the abstract idea of a Divine Creator is the most perfect philosophical basis for moral dealings among men as well as among nations. The sentence 'There is no God but God' which forms the first part of the Kalima is the source and fountain-head of all concepts of human justice, of the rights of the individual and the obligations of human groups towards each other.

God is Truth as opposed to falsehood. An individual who recognises this basic terms of reference is obliged to distinguish between right and wrong. Man's relationship to God is that of the creation to the creator. The fact that all men are the members of a great family is stated in the postulate that they are all children of Adam. Consequently, men are equal in the eyes of their Maker. No distinction of race, colour or social status can take away from an individual his rights in the eye of the law. Unless a society is dedicated to this principle, it can neither be a free nor happy nor even a human society. Pakistan as an Islamic state is within the confines of the Law of Right, and the prerogatives of

every citizen of Pakistan are assured in this Islamic State by virtue of his human status.

It would seem that some of the basic tenets of western nationalism are contrary to the spirit of Islam. The most obvious are the distinction of race, language territorial habitat or geographical location. The unreason of these distinctions was manifested in the barbarous persecution of minority groups in some of the most advanced and scientifically administered countries of Europe. Here there should be a lesson for those who would jettison the spirit of religion because they presume that their own reasoning goes beyond the eternal and ever-lasting values of Islam.

There are, however, other factors in the life of nations which cannot be overlooked in a world dominated by nationalism. The world is divided into nation-states, each one of which has set up a government for the furtherance of their prosperity within their frontiers and for the securing of their safety against foreign aggression. In this duty which the nations owe to themselves, the feelings of loyalty to the community, to its organised government and other institutions play an important part. The hills and valleys of our native land are dear to us. The customs and traditions which have been with us for a long time have a place in our affections, but for a Muslim these are not gods to be worshipped without reservation above the ever-lasting obligations that human beings owe to each other and to the principle of Truth. Herein lies an important distinction between an Islamic State and a secular state and only a cynic will say that in this basic regard, a secular state is better.

What beliefs an individual holds and what his real conception of the structure of human

society and the universe is, is known only to himself and to his Maker. In this regard religion must remain an exclusively personal affair. From the point of view of the community, the individual who has right belief is the most useful. Now what we call 'belief' is composed of intellectual conviction on the one hand and emotional attitude on the other. For instance, intellectually a person may be convinced of the social necessity of having faith and yet, paradoxically, intellectual analysis may not really lead him to faith. In such a case an individual may adopt a somewhat ambiguous course of paying lip service to a certain faith especially when he feels convinced that by so doing he promotes moral harmony in the aggregate of which he is a member. In this hypothetical instance it is obvious that such an individual will lack emotional fervour for the belief that he professes and will effect compromises in various details of his actions. On the other hand, another individual may find his intellectual as well as emotional processes in harmony with the time-honoured principles of right and wrong. His life then will be full of blessedness for himself and for those who are around him. Every action emanating from such an integrated personality will bear the colour of sincerity and will result in the happiness of all concerned. In the terminology of Islamic culture such an individual may be called a *Momin*. These consistencies however, lie in the realm of personality and can have but little concern with administrative statecraft.

Thinkers and philosophers of many ages and many countries have referred to Islam as a practical religion. This is so for Islam lays emphasis both on life in this world as well as existence in the next. In fact, the life hereafter has been made dependent upon the way a person conducts his affairs on this planet. The earthly life, therefore,

has been assigned the very greatest importance in Islam. Man has been placed on this earth as the vice-regent of God to wield sway over the elements for the furtherance of the objectives which have been determined for him by God. To equip him for playing the role of the Crown of Creation, Man has ben endowed with knowledge which is power. It would, therefore, be reasonable to argue that in proportion as Man gathers knowledge which is power, he is the vice-regent of God and fulfils his destiny as such. Thus for the Muslim it becomes obligatory, by the dictates of his religion, to acquire as much knowledge as he possibly can. An Islamic state must, therefore, lay the greatest emphasis on education and discovery in the realm of scientific and other knowledge.

By referring to mankind as the children of Adam, the *Quran* gives unmistakable direction with regard to their rights and obligations. No human being can, in an Islamic state, be accorded sub-human treatment, and since all men are equal in the eyes of God, they are also equal in the eyes of the law. Distinctions of high and low, rich and poor, black or white cannot be accorded weight in the formulation of government policy in an Islamic state. Having established this firm basis for the recognition of human dignity, it becomes easy for us to find sanction for the inalienable rights of man. It is a negation of human dignity to treat an individual unjustly, to deprive him of his freedom without proven cause, to take away from him the right to apprehend the truth through the medium of his senses and to state it through the power of speech. Nor can an individual be deprived of the right to have a say in the ordering of joint enterprises and the corporate effort of the group to which he belongs. We Pakistanis are, therefore, obliged

by the dictates of our ideology to evolve a society which will guarantee to the individual the freedom of thought and speech and make him a partner in the Government of his country.

The state is the collective aggregate of its individual citizens. Various thinkers have defined the functions of the state in various terms. Some western philosophers have accorded the state the place of God-head itself. The feudal concept of the state is embodied in the famous saying of a King of France: 'I am the State.' As in other walks of life so in this we find definite direction in the ideology of Islam. The state is no more and no less than the aggregate of the individuals who are its citizens. It exists for their common safety and welfare. When the collective entity of the state is threatened by a foreign aggressor or an epidemic or the enemy within the gates, the state takes action for the protection of common saftey and welfare. In this action every citizen has a vital interest, and while he enjoys the fruits of state-action he is also called upon to contribute his share towards it. In Islam, state action cannot be arbitrary. In the first place it must be bounded by the limitations imposed by God, and in the second it should be subject to consultation among the citizens constituting the state. There are innumerable variations of the duties and sacrifices which the individual may owe to the state, as well as of the services he may expect or demand from the state. Likewise, the basic principle of consultation or *Mushawarat* is interpretable in many ways and may be achieved through various kinds of state machinery. On this occasion it will be enough if the two fundamental desiderata *viz* common welfare and consultation are indicated.

It has already been stated that there is no room for distinctions of language, race and territory in

the Islamic version of nationhood. Consequently, the diversity in this regard among the people of Pakistan need not be a bar to the solidarity of our nation. Islam does not prevent us from taking pride in our culture and our traditions, provided that we exclude from our cultural inheritence such traditions (if indeed any such exist) as are contrary to the Islamic postulate of justice and fairplay among men or are hurtful to the dignity of any individuals or groups belonging to the human family. Similarly we have the right to be proud of our earthly inheritence which may consist of the land that is ours and the elements which fill the space above and below that land. We can love and cherish our language and literature, our songs and dances, our hills and valleys, but it is imperative that we do not accord them disproportionate emphasis in the ordering of our corporate life. We must not worship them as gods on whose altars we should sacrifice truth and justice, honour and decency, and those duties which Islam lays upon us as the vice-regents of a Just and Beneficient God. While we revel in our cultural diversity as gardeners revel in the colours, sizes and shapes of the flowers that they grow, we must not let this diversity lessen our concern with the safety, prosperity and unity of our nation as a whole any more than a gardener should suffer certain shrubs and plants to wither and the conduits and fountains to run dry in order to irrigate a patch of peonies or tulips elsewhere.

In Islam, the philosophy of an all-embracing Brotherhood of Muslims which goes beyond racial, cultural and geographical diversities, is the most valuable single factor in the promotion of national unity.

Since the Islamic ideology is of such great importance to the people and the Government

of this country, it cannot but follow that all matters should be referable to it. Here an important question arises. What are the standards by which comformity to Islam shall be measured? For purposes of discussion it will be useful to recognise two distinct regions in the ideology. The first and the one which has basic and primary importance is the spirit of Islam. The second sphere is the world of matter in which that spirit manifests itself in various theological practices, rites and rituals. While the former sphere, *viz* the spirit of Islam should be constantly before every government of Pakistan and every one of its public functionaries, the latter *viz* the theocratic sphere, must be left to individuals and non-Government groups to be ordered according to the dictates of their conscience and belief. The Government cannot sponsor a particular kind of mechanics of religion. To do so on its part will be the prelude to national disintegration. There are many shades of religious faith and equally numerous theologies within the sphere of Islam. The State which exists and acts on behalf of all citizens whatever their belief, must of necessity proceed on a plane where divergent theologies join in a common source. This common source is the universal postulate of an omnipotent and indivisible God-head and the ethical spirit of Islam. In other words, the Government of Pakistan must interpret religion in terms of morality and not in terms of dogma. Insistence by the state on the mechanics of any particular theology or ritual associated with any particular dogma will be disastrous to the unity and solidarity of the country, besides being hurtful to cause of the social and material evolution of its people.

Here it may be asked what shall be the attitude of the state to dogma and theocratic

practices? The answer would be that the Government which is the executive agency of the state should look upon the practice of different religious rights and rituals by its citizens with sympathetic non-interference. It is, however, axiomatic that no religious practices destructive of ethical and moral principles or likely to become the cause of disturbance of peace can be permitted by the state.

The Inner Revolution

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 27th October, 1959)

The revolution is all around us; we are sharing its impetus and its high-spirited urge to progress and reform. We are gaining confidence in our destiny and have regained the belief in ourselves with which about twenty years ago, we started fighting for a home and a name in the comity of nations.

But there are still some hindrances in our way. There are a number of outward hindrances, but there are some that are within us and in the case of not a few of us, have become organic to our consciousness. It is this last class of obstacle with which we are concerned in this article.

The Past:

In order to understand our difficulties in this regard we need to look at our past which has conditioned us to the state of mind in which the majority of us find ourselves today.

Having been subjected to slavery for a century or more, our approach to organised government was one of hostility. Prior to independence, there was not a single educated, self-respecting individual who did not harbour a sub-current of opposition to the agency of foreign dominance and exploitation. This state of mind had become almost an integral part of our public instinct. After independence, after the first flush of triumph was over (and even in those ecstatic times sorrow at the loss of the dead and the departed who had been massacred by the implacable enemy had clutched at our hearts and tainted our joy) the

realities of our economic and sociological disorganisation began to obtrude themselves on our consciousness. We had been robbed,exploited and demoralised for upwards of a century and the signs of ruin met our eyes in all directions. Worst of all, we began to slip unconsciously, into the frame of mind represented by the cliche: "The slave mentality," and with a curious blindness began to be hostile and contrary to the Government, which was the outcome of our own efforts at national organisation. The historian of the future will be surprised at the fact that an independent and free people spent a whole decade in opposing their own government and thwarting its policies.

Amazingly, it became a sign of respectable thinking to decry the struggling machinery of the State and to be pleased at the failures and shortcomings of our own appointed management. This malady, which one might describe as a relapse into mental slavery, became so widespread that the respectable citizenry despaired of ever climbing out of the morass, and individuals the fibre of whose being was a shade less strong, began to fend, each one, for himself, robbing the common exchequer and letting the business of the nation go by default. Moral despair and mental frustration leads to pleasure-worship and the pursuit of base and selfish luxury. The extent of our ruin may be gauged by the fact that prior to the October Revolution, the entire middle class which included the leader class, were engaged in building palaces, soliciting joyrides to the funfairs of the West and accumulating such toys as domestic gadgets and motor cars. All this while production was lagging behind our expanding requirements and the average Pakistani citizen was being ground down by widespread scarcities in basic needs.

Greatest Achievement:

I regard it as the greatest achievement of our new regime that it has helped to dispel the dark clouds of despair which had engulfed the entire Pakistani race. When Martial Law was proclaimed in the land, the nation heaved a sigh of relief, for, prior to the Revolution, conditions were such that the average citizen was expecting law and order to break down any moment. Strong men trembled at the impending prospect of chaos breaking loose and blighting with murder and arson the villages and towns of our beautiful motherland.

The New Order came suddenly and after the initial uncertainty and suspicion, faded hopes began to revive. When a number of disciplined and patriotic men took the helm and spoke of reform and reconstruction in firm and straightforward language, the nation experienced a resurge of pride and confidence for here was proof that Pakistan was viable and that the fires of energy and idealism still glowed under the ashes.

Realistic Approach:

But the nation has still to learn a number of lessons. Firstly, that though miracles are not impossible, yet they take time to happen and a machinery has to be forged to bring them about. Those who hoped that there would be more food on every table in the land on the evening of 7th October merely because their helmsman has proclaimed a new order in the morning, need to realise that that kind of miracle does not form a part of the schemes of nature. It took the British several decades to evolve a policy and forge a machinery by which the wealth of this country should be piped to the economic lifelines of Britain.

The task before Pakistanis now consists in understanding the realities of their economic situation, in working tirelessly day and night to create a new mechanism, to be prepared for the greatest sacrifices to resist foreign attempts at the continuance of old, baneful policies and to be prepared to be alone, strictly and absolutely alone, in their struggle for survival. In short, our first necessity today is the avoidance of easy optimism and a realistic refusal to live in the proverbial paradise devised for the inhabitance of fools. The key values which emerge from this realism are patience, self-denial and austerity—not the austerity which consists merely in the abjuration of imported luxuries, but that taxing and exhausting austerity which should be related to the abject poverty and destitution which is the lot of ninety per cent of our brothers and sisters.

The second lesson, which is so important that I doubt if we should not regard it as the first and the primary, is that each one of us is apt to slip back into the slavish attitude of the pre-Independence era. The first mark of this attitude is the tendency to dislike your own Government, to criticise them for all they do, to think that they are outside of you, that they are other than the nation, to feel no concern for their mistakes, to point gleefully at their failures, to fail to assist them in all ways and generally to behave as if they were still the agency of foreign rule. This I repeat, is the fundamental danger. We have lived so long with this attitude that it would be strange if we did not fall back into it at the first unguarded moment. But let us understand what is happening to us and let us coolly realise the penalties and punishments that we and our children will have to undergo, if we do not fight down this suicidal tendency. No free people feel that they are other than their Government.

No self-respecting citizen of an independent country says to himself: "The Government are stupid but that is none of my business. Wait till they break their shins over this or that." A patriot would feel directly responsible for everything that happens in the country. Only a mad man and a slave would revel in the realisation that the Government of his country was in error or difficulty.

Corollary to this attitude is the tendency to believe that the Government does not mean what it says. For a hundred years, before Independence, it was indeed often so. The reality of the purpose of the foreign ruler was indeed different from his presentation of it. Before Independence this scepticism concerning the Government was correct, intelligent and honourable. But what is the picture of things now?

Here is a government we have ourselves set up —how and through what ups and downs does not concern us here; but the fact remains that we alone are responsible for having formed this Government. Is it, then, reasonable to suspect every action that it initiates? Should we always say, when some one gives the call to go forward, to improve, to be hardworking and patriotic: "Oh all that stuff we know. Nobody means that. This is only a facade which deceives nobody, least of all myself. These are just words, the truth is different, must be different. I shall not believe them: I shall always suspect them." This attitude is the hall-mark of the slave who does not know his shackles have fallen. He still believes that he is chained to the wall and tragically sees in the appearance of his brother, the image of his former master. Such a dazed person is more to be pitied than blamed; but, then, the stern logic of nature does not pause for pity. If

the freed slave remains dazed too long, he might find that some other marauder has indeed put new chains upon him.

So let us have faith in our Government. They may now and then be mistaken; they may (being of us) fall into our own error and some of our public servants may speak and act as if they were our masters; but let us make allowance for that. Let us, in the main, believe that our Government means what it says. It cannot but be so. They are not operating here from a foreign base. They cannot but have the objectives that are also our objectives.

National Objectives:

Our third danger is what I shall call the Danger of Shortsighted Involvement Freed peoples with the spirit of heroism flowing through them, do not become easy victims to this danger; but disorganised people do. The primary source from which this danger springs is losing sight of national objectives. Small and unworthy objectives spring up only when the great and noble objectives are forgotten.

Our national progress can be described in the metaphor of a marching caravan reaching for a far away, glorious destination. If the members of the caravan do not constantly keep the destination in the focus of their purpose, but forget it, they will fall victims to chance distractions. They will be attracted by minor objectives whose passing glitter might lead them off the highway and the caravan will degenerate into a trail of stragglers each facing a different way If this calamity overtakes a caravan, we do not have to be prophets to be able to foretell that such a caravan will not arrive at its destination but that its indisciplined

and shortsighted members will stray away into the unknown to become the prey of vultures and hyenas.

Let us be careful that we who are the caravan of Pakistanis do not lose the direction of the promised destination which is the strength, prosperity and stability of Pakistan. Let us search our hearts and see if we have not owned up other short-sighted objectives which are but the shimmerings of mirages. Let us see if some of these mirages are not distracting us.

Ostentation:

We should ask ourselves if we are not involved in such suicidal activities as promoting provincialism and regionalism at the cost of national solidarity. Are we taken up with such toys as building houses and acquiring imported conveniences such as refrigerators, air-conditioners, washing machines and the like by taking undue advantage of our public position? Is our attention being distracted from the path of national service by our absorption in means of luxury and security? Has the ambition of our lives become so petty as to be identified with the putting up of a modern house which should bring us rent? Are we actuated by the childish desire of being seen driving about in the newest and biggest automobile in the town? Is our time being largely spent in hunting little concessions and privileges—a piece of cheap cloth or a few tins of special cigarettes or a permit for a car with the highest re-sale value?

Has our concept of justice and unselfish conduct deteriorated so far that we take pride in the harassment of everyone who does not

croak in our own dialect in the tiny little well where we are the biggest frog?

Having been exploited for upwards of a century, with foreign interests still trying to herd us on the old economic paths, with almost no real technological development and prospects of none for many a year, we are faced with continued hardship and travail, Regeneration must spring from within us for that is the way of all regeneration. Let each one of us look within and see whether the values of freedom and justice, equality and fairplay, hard work and high endeavour have indeed taken roots in our hearts.

Thoughts on Basic Democracies

(*September, 1959*)

The definitions of democracy are many and various. Literally democracy means the government of the people. At one stage in the history of Europe it was customary to call democracy 'government by the will of the people.' The best known definition of democracy was given by Abraham Lincoln who called it the government of the people, by the people and for the people.

What do all these definitions mean? Such abstractions as 'the will of the people' become recognisable reality only when they are seen to be effective in action. It is only after interpretation in practice that we can say whether a Government embodies the will of the people or is otherwise; whether it exists for the best promotion of the people's welfare or is a form of exploitation; whether it is government by the people or by a minority standing apart from the common masses. The definitions of democracy given by writers under the influence of modern European thought would thus appear to demand augmentation which we will subsequently seek in the thought of Islam.

It has been said that the governments of the city states of ancient Greece were truly democratic for everyone voted for every law and thus had a share in the making of it. If it is said that in such a state a few eloquent persons gifted with persuasiveness are likely to have made all or most of the laws, it would be difficult to negate the assertion. In fact, some thinkers have held that although the leaders of Athen and Sparta

achieved a democratic relation to the government, in reality they formed a ruling caste and, therefore, the ancient Greek democracies were partly oligarcical.

Besides the Greek city states, a classic instance of approximately unalloyed democracy, is the civic administration of the Isle of Man. According to the Manx law, for which political romanticists claim an unbroken tradition several hundred years old, everyone or almost everyone votes for each law. In this case, as in the case of democracies of ancient Greece, the limited electorate, residing in a small area made possible the enactment of laws without the intermediacy of representatives.

Instances of the practice of democracy in the elemental form exist upto the present day in Pakistan. The *Jirga* government of some of the tribal communities living in the north of West Pakistan were, before the impact of British invasion, among the freest communities of the world. These tribes governed themselves on a pattern approximating closely to the classical ideal of democracy. In the enforcement of natural justice, the concept of which had become interwoven with a strict code of honour, the tribal communities of West Pakistan provide even today a unique instance of egalitarian society. These democracies owed a fierce allegiance to universal concepts of human rights which they derived from Islam. Their moral impregnability was such that almost a centry of ruthless suppression of the armed might of the Biritsh Empire left their freedom intact and caused their proud traditions to be surrounded with a halo of romantic heroism.

In the non-technological aspect the level of the people's culture is considerably higher in this

country than in most, if indeed not all European countries. The sophistication and objectivity with which the mass of the people in Pakistan view physical reality has been too often misunderstood as apathy and ignorance. The standpoint from which a European colonialist in Algeria or Kenya appears superior to a Pakistani peasant who regards calamity as organic to the nature of reality, may appear barbaric against the background of universal moral values. It would be naive, therefore, to assume that in devising the mechanics of Islamic democracy in Pakistan, we are dealing with primitive and ignorant humanity. Western military subjugation, economic exploitation and technological repression for more than a century may have deprived the average Pakistani of the outward graces which accompany plenty, but to deem this disability as a failing of character would amount to taking a superficial view of things.

We have witnessed the collapse of 'democracy' in Pakistan within a decade of independence. It would be instructive to know what kind of a 'democracy' it was that failed. How were the seeds of this 'democracy' sown and how was it nurtured under a foreign military occupation.

It must be remembered that the *raison d'etre* of the British conquests in South Asia was the economical advantage that would accrue to the British nation from them. The political and military aspects of these conquests were devised to promote the realisation of maximum economic gains to Britain. The main features of the political economy of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent during the British regime are common knowledge. The conquerors made every effort to develop this area as an agricultural supply base for their industrial

prosperity. To mobilise and exploit the agricultural masses they needed allies and agents from among the people. They found these agents and allies by introducing "Democracy." Thousands of "peoples' representatives" became members of Municipal Committees, District Boards and provincial assemblies. These worthies were granted special privileges, opportunities for making money and were even allowed to interfere with the operation of laws in order to favour their supporters. As time passed these practises became so much a part of the political tradition of the land that they were taken almost for granted.

Thus when Pakistan came into being, poljticians trained in the tradition of British imperial "democracy" thought less of their real obligations towards the people than their personal privileges and the gains that accrued to them from the excercise of power. Leaving aside the goal of national welfare and prosperity, they started a scramble for individual benefits. It seemed that every Department of the Goverment was being run to provide opprotunities for a few hundred politicians and their friends. Their avarice grew with their fortunes and leaving aside all pretence of national service they openly and cynically began to make and break governments as their interests of the moment demanded.

Apart from the loss to the nation in the sphere of internal progress and betterment of the people's standard of living, Pakistan suffered a serious set-back in the international field. One Government succeeded another in a series of kaliedoscopic changes and none was able to bargain with any appearance of firmness with either of the two world blocks. The preparedness of America to supply certain immediate wants caused Pakistan's foreign policy to take on a one-

sided complexion. During the decade after Partitition, American diplomats and foreign experts were able to steer Pakistan's shaky economy on to the path of increasing dependence upon foreign aid. It is possible that a strong government in Pakistan could have compelled its American allies to help in making a beginning in the sphere of basic and heavy industry. In actual fact Americans found the weak Pakistani politicains only too ready to comply with their wishes. The highest ranking office-holders in the Central Government were not above throwing away the prospect of national prosperity in exchange for such personal advantages as agencies for motor cars and steel imports. As a result the Americans and their British allies were able to pursuade Pakistan to continue being a raw material producing region and a market for West European manufacutred goods as this area had been during the period of British rule.

No historical prophet could have foretold the culmination of this degenerate political process. It is not impossible that a strong and unscrupulous group might have chosen to exploit feelings of regional prejudice and plunged the country into civil war. It is equally likely that the sparking of internal strife might have assumed the form of a class war and the gains of centuries might have been thrown over-board in an orgy of blood and destruction.

The Revolution of October, 1958 was a quiet and complete change in the sources from which the Government derived its motivation. How far had the old politicians outlived their usefulness and acceptance by the people became apparent when the group of firm and patriotic men who signalised their exodus, stepped into the politicians' place as uneventfully as though it had been

a vacuum. The change came like the inrush of fresh air into the suffocating atmosphere of a closed room. Instead of originating in the expediency and profit interests of a handful of politicians who seemed to bestride the legislative bodies with the tenacity of the Old Man of the Sea, the policies of the Government instantaneously fell in line with the wishes of the people. The new Government, although it was as prone and liable to make mistakes as any other body of men in their position, met with so much understanding, co-operation and tolerance, that observers both at home and abroad became convinced of the viability of the Pakistani nation. The revolutionaries acted with great caution and moderation and proceeded to carry on the task of reconstruction and repair with a firmness and speed which won the approval of their anxious countrymen. Indeed in some basic regards the revolutionaries met with outstanding success. The feudal burden of mankind has not yet been shaken off in its entirety, and in the all-important spheres of land reform the new Government took a giant stride forward. The problem of the rehabilitation of refugees lay like a dead weight on the creative and reconstructive energies of its citizens. Firm and expedient steps paved the way for the removal of psychological indecision which had so far impeded the plans of refugees. In other fields too, reformatory steps met with substantial success. On the whole Pakistan took a great step forward on the path of national solidarity in the space of a mere twelve months.

While the new regime was clearing the debris of past misadventures, it was also busy with looking further into the future. It was universally recognised that in the final analysis the demands of national welfare required that Pakistan should emerge as a democracy. For the

realisation of this ideal in due course certain steps were required to be taken.

By being parodied for purpose of exploitation, representive government had become so far discredited in Pakistan that in order to make true democracy prevail, its basic and fundamental values had to be rediscovered. Obviously, this could only be done, if these values were made to prevail in the working of a mechanism in which all citizens should take a part. Today the country is poised to begin its march towards the ideal of a truly democratic national Government.

It is proposed to initiate the change on the basic level and with a suitable mechanism. The cast of this mechanism should be such that the participants should be generally able to consult among themselves at the foundational level. It is only through being engaged in the serious business of daily life that the individual citizens can accustom himself to taking an unselfish and patriotic view of the collective problems of the community. Without real responsibility which should have a bearing on actual results in matters of daily concern to everyone, the democratic sense cannot be awakened.

Consultation or "*mushawarat*" as a factor in public life has an ancient tradition in Pakistan. The "*panchayat*" in which trusted members of the community became its representatives has from times immemorial settled disputes and determined dealings among individuals and groups. The world "*punch*" which designates a person known for his public spirit, impartiality and moral sense, is a part of the idiom of the national speech of Pakistan.

No institution that is an entirely foreign graft can succeed in any country on a nation-

wide scale. Fortunately democracy in terms of consultation and arbitrament had been an ever present factor in the rural society of Pakistan. Even when the country was in the grip of tyrannous regimes, most of the immediate problems and disputes were settled by "*panchayat*" comprising the best and the wisest in the community. It is a matter of regret that the pre-independence imperial regime made efforts to distort even the time-hallowed institution of the *panchayat*. Administrative officers of the British empire appointed permanent *panchayats* from among those who were distinguished not so much for their devotion to the welfare of their community and the principle of right, as for their being trusted agents of the satraps of the imperial crown. By conferring official recognisation as *punch's* on its accomplices, the foreign conquerer made the peasant dependent on them and thus exercised remote control on the day to day life of the rural masses. It is significant that many of these official *panchayats* existed only in name and most of the dealings and disputes were either taken to the judicial courts or settled by unofficial *panchayats* summoned by the concerned person according to need and occasion. We thus see that democracy in the basic sense of consultation has always existed in the substratum of Pakistani society. The fundamental terms of reference of these *panchayats* or, as we might call them, basic democracies, has always been the principle of right implying the responsibility which every individual owes to God. This foundational metaphor of the kingdom of God is invariably invoked by Pakistanis when they refer to dealings and disputes among men. Without having recourse to technicalities, everyone knows what the rights of every one are and invokes the fear of God as a corrective to the lawless impulses of an individual. One might say that the concept of

human rights and the equal status of all before their Maker is by far the most precious political possession of Pakistan. No political mechanism would be worth much, if this matrix of moral relations of men on an egalitarian basis did not exist in the conscious instinct of the millions in this country.

Given the essential and fundamental awareness of justice and fairplay among men as being organic to the Islamic concept of the universe, we have the subsoil on which the plant of healthy political life can grow. Before that could be done, it was necessary to clear the tangled undergrowth which had cumbered this fair land during the past century of neglect and calamity. This was done when some trusted inviduals of the nation gave the signal on 28th October 1958. All political parties and political bodies ceased to exist on that fateful day in the history of Pakistan. The break from the nightmare past in which exploitation had been termed democratic and many a fair name used to cover the iniquitous processes of injustice, has been complete as far as formal and symbolic action can make it.

The time has, therefore, come to make this break from the dreadful past really and truly effective, and to bury its "portions and parcels" that lie in the recesses of our consciousness, so deep that they do not impede our progress. The awareness of democracy and the pattern of justice and fairplay among men has always been with us as Muslims. The Fear of God, the Way of God and the Omnipotence of God are expressions which are in daily use with the Pakistanis in moments when they are moved, roused or challenged. As such there is no question of starting a democratic and just way of life with us: the problem is that we remove the

impediments and obstructions from our way which is naturally the path of those who believe in a Beneficent Purpose in the universe and look upon all men as brethren descended from Adam.

The problem of the basic democracies is therefore, not so much the problem of their mechanical structure as the problem of avoiding the ways of slavery. The accident of history and the unscrutable will of God involved us in national calamity for over a century. Our misfortunes have left scars, some of them still imperfectly healed, on our life of the intellect and the spirit. Our interpretation of success of life, of dignity, of prosperity and honourable living has been clouded by the misfortune of alien subjugation. To put it bluntly, so warped have the values of some of us become that if one of the prophets of old, or a figure from the age of Homer, or even the peasant hero Garibaldi who liberated Italy from the imperial tyrannies of Spain and Austria, was to be presented to us as the prototype of human glory, some of us would not perhaps accept them as our models of success. It is in realising the vision of true honour, true freedom and true success that the battle of everyone of us lies. In order to reconstruct the fabric of real democracy, we must begin at a stage at which democracy can be made to prevail in its elemental and pure form. For this purpose democratic units of a size commensurate with the need for effective '*mushawarat*' or consultation must be instituted. Already we have the ancient tradition of village *panchayats*. We should do well to adopt this tradition in the context of modern independent nationhood.

It has been proposed to initiate basic democracies in the country by having manageable

units (comprising about 1,000 persons each) and entrusting to them in right earnest the task of managing such of their affairs as do not need to be arranged on a national scale. We do not need to be bound by any delimiting factors imposed by the practices of the past imperial regime in determing what should be the scope of these democracies. Let them take over such functions pertaining to collective welfare and law and order as they should look after in their own best interests. These functions have so far been discharged by nominees of the Government which has been regarded by our rural population as a remote entity. Government officials have been looked upon as representatives of alien power and as such the unalterable data of life with the sun and the stars and the ground we walk upon. The basic step in self-government should require that we realise that the Government wherever it impinges on our lives, is a function of our own volition, our own foresight and calculation. We shall seek to mould our daily house-keeping not through supplication to remote powers, either spiritual or temporal, but by exercising the human faculties of wise thinking, industrial planning and collective endeavour through *mushawarat*.

So this is the problem of basic democracies. Their proposed mechanism namely an elected majority plus some nominated members is as good as any to start with. If the spirit of self-government is awakened, it matters little what the mechanism is. To all appearances it seems a suitable and economical means of making democracy prevail in the sphere of every-day community life. Improvements and modification of this system will follow naturally after it has been tried out in practice. It might later on be deemed desirable to change the label of basic democracies and call them something else; to

abolish the nominated elements, to increase the number of representatives, to hold elections more often or less often; to make the Government official further subservient to the wishes of the members in certain regards or to make them independent in certain others. A thousand problem of procedure will have to be settled and the final aspect will emerge after a period of trial and error.

Youth to the Fore

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 18th June, 1959)

When, contrary to tradition, Iqbal the poet-philosopher of modern Islam, called upon the young to become the leaders of the community, he merely re-stated the philosophy of revolution. In static societies custom clogs the sources of progress and change. It is in such human aggregates that rebels against tradition play a revitalising role. Youth, with characteristic audacity and daring breaks through the inertia of custom and its unfettered thought and action arrives at new frontiers of achievement.

Youth stands for the principle of change in the universe. The new generation represents another attempt by Mother Nature to re-cast the shape of things and re-vitalise the race. Rising young men and women carry with them the promise of new adjustments and their untired eyes look out for new horizons.

But youth must be nurtured and prepared to cope with the challenge of the times. The creative energies of young people can be frittered away in pursuit of inferior objectives. The adult part of society owe it to the future to provide conditions in which youth will grow up unhampered by ignorance, disease and starvation of the body and the mind. History tells us that those communities which invested their energies and their resources in the upbringing of their youth, dominated their environment when their boys and girls entered into their national inheritance. On the other hand, powerful societies gradually atrophied and went into decline for they neglected the rising generations. They amassed great wealth and

built splendid edifices but, left no worthy inheritors of their achievement. The chronicles of the past speak of many an obliterated name which shone with glory for a while but was snuffed out for lack of worthy sons and daughters.

In the present-day world Pakistan is accounted as considerable because of the magnificent human resources with which nature has endowed her Because of the accidents of history, the material resources of the young State are yet undeveloped and in a world which has been transformed by industrial and technological revolution, Pakistan is looked upon as a backward country. In the comity of rich and sophisticated peoples, Pakistan has entered as a large-limbed peasant, respected for her size and her ancient civilisation but accorded an inferior place for she does not make any ships, 'planes, tanks and other hardware.

But this brawny peasant has twenty-million sons and daughters of the school-going age. This number is three times the total population of Holland or Belgium and almost half the population of France or Italy or the island of Great Britain. A decade from now the place of Pakistan in the council of nations will depend on how many of her twenty-million boys and girls become engineers and scientists, doctors, lawyers and captains of industry. In the troubled times that lie ahead of the human race, Pakistan will fare as she can develop her most precious asset—her bright and numerous youth.

The available resources of Pakistan are limited. Yet the best of these resources must be invested in the upbringing and education of the youth of the nation for no other investment will bring the same rich returns. When there is not enough to go round, and young mouths are unfed

and young backs are uncovered, all waste must be eliminated. A people who do not have schools cannot afford palaces. When there are not enough playgrounds for children, private lawns and gardens are not justified. When there are few school buses, imported motor cars should not be too many. Above all the conscious section of the nation should devote less thought to clothes, luxury cars and air-conditioning of palatial residences, and should talk and think more of schools, text-books, libraries, museums, milk and other pure food for children, juvenile games, sports and playgrounds.

The Role of the Intellectual in Pakistan

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 23rd June, 1959*)

In his recent thought-provoking address to the students of the Government College, Lahore, Mr. Qudratullah Shahab pointed an accusing finger at the intellectuals of the country. According to him, they "saw and sulked" instead of engaging energetically in untangling the knots which contemporary forces created in the fabric of national existence. If the intellectuals had grappled earnestly with the problems that came up before the young nation, instead of remaining superciliously and cynically reticent about the important issues, the history of the past decade would have been different from what it has been.

In referring to the intellectual as the central figure of national life, Mr. Shahab has not exaggerated his importance. The motivation behind all collective effort proceeds from the thought-content of the community. The intellectual interprets reality, generalises from the particular and the specific, takes note of significant events and forecasts the shape of the future. He sounds the warning note when the community takes to the path of decline and appeals for better sense when degenerate practices grip important strata of the social organisation. The statesman, the politician, the industrialist, as well as the professional workers, look to the intellectual for advice and criticism, for praise and blame. By virtue of his role, the intellectual is the mind and conscience of the community.

The achievements of Pakistan during the past ten years are the achievements of its commerical

community and its lay citizenry. Its failures are the failures of its intellectual class. When the inexperienced politician, the rapidly-promoted civil servant and the tradesman grown rich overnight succumbed to sloth and greed, the intellectual should have roused them to the danger of the future. In a society in which honesty and altruism were beginning to be regarded as folly and eccentricity, the intellectual should have upheld the eternal values. Again, when dishonesty and thievery were being taken as the manifestations of cleverness and wordly-wisdom, the voice of the intellectual world should have risen in indignant protest. A free society is one which gives the law unto itself, and nowhere can freedom and the rule of law prevail when the conscious section of the community is not only reluctant to call a thief a thief but, on the other hand, goes to the extent of hinting that the dishonest opportunist may indeed be the one who had the most cleverness and foresight. Such was the pass to which Pakistani society had come in the first decade of its existence, and its thinking and feeling section had done little to prevent it.

Saddest Aspect:

The saddest aspect of the failure of the intellectual class in Pakistan was its loss of confidence in its role and its high destiny. Incredible as it may sound, the journalist, the medical man, the teacher and the divine spoke of themselves and their work as though they were the most unfortunate class of people and enviously eyed the vulgar spendthrifts among corrupt officials and politicians. If the intellectual class had unleashed the thunder of its condemnation against these enemies of decency and public welfare, the latter would have found the taste of their ill-gotten gains turning to poison in their voracious mouths. The

crop of upstart malefactors would have withered before the scorn of the vocal and patriotic intellectual and the body-politic would have been purged of the evil which, as time passed, raged like a fever in its veins and sinews.

The intellectual has a decisive role in the future of Pakistan. In the truest sense of the word, he is the maker of the nation's policy, for it is he who engenders the thought behind national action. For close upon a hundred years before independence, the pressure of foreign rule had resulted in the suppression of national thought. During that period, the intellectual classes acquired the habit of keeping aloof from public affairs. Quite understandably, their attitude was one of silent hostility to the State. They were afraid of committing themselves openly on matters of public moment, for these were arranged by the foreigner in keeping with his own interests. The thinking section of the public had two ways open to them: on the one hand, defiance of the foreign ruler and open opposition of all his works and on the other, veiled hostility of all State policy which expressed itself in privately spoken satire and cynical innuendo. This role of the conscious and enlightened minority was natural and understandable in the context of alien rule and political dependence.

New Situation:

With the arrival of independence the situation has changed completely. The responsibilities of free citizenship demand a far more positive role from the intellectual minority. Far from maintaining an appearance of non-committal disinterestedness, the educated citizen is now called upon to take a keen and unflagging interest in all branches of national house-keeping. He must

forthwith shoulder his burden of responsibility and do so of his own volition and initiative. It is no longer for outsiders to invite or permit him to take an interest in the affairs of his own country. He is his own master now and it is wholly up to him how he manages his endowment. True, the inertia and hypnosis of the preindependence days persists. We are apt, unconsciously, to fall into the old attitudes and forget that we are masters in our home. This inertia, however, must be vigorously countered. The intellectual has an onerous burden in the difficult times through which the human society is passing. He must straightaway set about putting his house in order and must put his will to the task. As the mind and conscience of the nation, the intellectual class must guide and steer, must weigh and assess, oppose the wrong and lend support to the right. The old risks and dangers are no more. There is only one danger now—the danger of not doing enough and not deserving the jewel of freedom which is the highest gift of God in a world torn by anxiety, want and strife.

The Third Greatest Problem of Pakistan

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 14th August, 1959*)

While man-made satellites are soaring in inter-stellar space and rocket-liners are girdling the globe in routine flights, Pakistan's chances of making her first motor-vehicle lie still far in the dim future. Nations are speeding past in the technological race while the fifth most numerous people in the world sit stranded on the wayside shackled to the mile-stone of the pre-Iron Age agriculture.

After Kashmir and the Irrigation Canal Water dispute with India, the 3rd great problem which confronts Pakistan today is the problem of industrial and technological backwardness. In the middle of the Twentieth Century when the advanced nations of the world are searching the heavens for power, Pakistan has yet to make a beginning in laying the foundations of basic industrial growth without which 'progress' and 'development' are meaningless terms.

Today wealth is synonymous with machinery. The conquest of distance, of disease, of discomfort, of want, the elimination of degrading and brutalising labour are corollaries of a single dominant factor, *viz.*, technological advancement. Without machinery mankind would revert to the level of civilisation connoted by the Stone-Age.

Let us take the example of agriculture. There can be no advancement in agriculture without machinery. At the primitive level such implements, as hoes, scythes, plough-shares and the

like, which in scientific language are termed simple machines, are essential for the achievement of any production whatsoever. One can imagine the effect on production if these iron tools which are forged by indigenous black-smiths in each village in Pakistan were taken away from the peasants.

Use of Machinery:

In the past fifty years, all progress in agriculture, in terms of labour-saving, efficiency and increased production can be traced to the use of machinery. The use of such machinery as the revolving fodder cutter, steel sugar-cane press, the persian wheel with steel shafts and bearings, marks true and lasting progress in the sphere of agriculture. The importance of this will be realised if we were to suppose, for a moment, that the revolving fodder-cutter was to be replaced by the old *toka* or chopper, the iron sugar-cane press by wooden rollers and the iron bearings and shafts of the persian wheel were to be taken away and massive tree-trunks fitted in their place on a million water-wells in the country.

Luckily this is not likely to happen for these improved agricultural machines are made in the country and none of them has to be imported. In most villages the fodder-cutter and the persian wheel components are laboriously hammered out by the village black-smith. If the availability of these essential implements was to become subject to the vicissitudes of import and the discretion of foreign aid agencies, agricultural production would drop and the country would be faced with a major economic crisis.

On the other hand, if agriculture was to advance a step further on the path of mechanisa-

tion, production would be sure to rise. In fact it seems that with the existing industrial background in the country, it will not be possible to increase production beyond a marginal quantity. Two essential items of equipment seem necessary for a substantial increase in cereal and other farm produce. The power-operated water pump must be used on a much greater scale and the electric and oil motor industry must be grounded in the country. There is no manner of doubt that equipping the existing village smithies with small lathes, foundries, drilling machines and similar tools, will enable the indigenous artisans to repair and even manufacture substantial parts of irrigation pump equipment. There are hundreds of tiny workshops in Lahore and Gujranwala wherein illiterate workmen are already making electric fan motors, small pumping units, sewing machines and the like.

Stark Necessity:

The second stark necessity for Pakistani agriculture today is power-operated ploughs or tractors. There seems no reason why this machinery should not be manufactured in the country. Of course, Pakistan would need a certain amount of foreign help to be able to do this, and it seems odd that those foreign powers which are directly interested in Pakistan developing on agricultural lines, have not during the past decade made a move towards rendering assistance in this regard. Perhaps, the ability to manufacture agricultural tractors would take Pakistan forward on the path of industrial advancement which is contrary to the economic interests of certain industrialised foreign powers. Nevertheless Pakistan must rapidly change over from the crawling bullock or buffalo-drawn plough to the power-operated tractor. This transformation is un-

imaginable unless tractors are made within the country. Any investment made in this direction will be rapidly recovered in the shape of enormously increased agricultural returns.

It may well be asked: "Why have these reforms, if they were so obviously desirable, been so long delayed?" There are cogent reasons for this happening. The foremost of these, is the remnants of the propaganda tradition which the British, as an industrialised colonial power, anxious to maintain her markets, naturally fostered. The Village Uplift Movement while emphasising cleanliness of dwellings, improved seed, conservation of manure, etc., steered completely clear of mechanisation. If Pakistan started making her own tractors and for that purpose, her own steel, other industry, *e.g.*, motor vehicles would come up naturally, and within a decade Pakistan would become a modern power. The slogans devised for this movement took such hold of the official mind that even today they crop up again and again in connection with Village AID and similar undertakings. For instance one sometimes hears that unemployment among agricultural labourers will increase if mechanisation is ushered in. A little thought makes it clear that relief from back-breaking labour, besides enabling the village population to give more attention to improvement in their conditions of living, will also make possible the employment of those methods of scientific cultivation for which the cultivators at present have neither the will nor the energy. A large number of bullocks will become unnecessary if we resort to power-ploughing and lifting water through mechanical means. In other words the vast area which is now under fodder crops for draught cattle, would be placed under food and other crops raising production by a margin far greater than the prevailing shortages.

Most of us are familiar with the type of comment on Pakistani citizenry in general and the rural population in particular which lays most of the blame for all that goes wrong on individual and collective failings of character. One often hears people saying: "We don't work! We are bone lazy. . . .It will be some time before we become honest with ourselves. . . .We lie as a matter of course; truth is the last thing that dawns on us. . . .etc." This is unjust and very wrong.

Looking over the West Pakistan landscape in the month of December, even the casual observer is awed by the sheer vastness of the area sown under wheat. For hundreds of miles the face of the land has been scratched by human labour and the seed dropped so that Pakistan may live for another year. To label those who carry out this stupendous task with almost bare hands as lazy, unimaginative and unenterprising is to be guilty of atrocious injustice. These heroic people are facing the demands of the 20th century, while their equipment belongs to the medieval age. Shall we blame then if they don't have the leisure and outward graces that accompany plenty? Would it be entirely wrong then if we said that the spate of exhortation and condemnation that we have unloosed upon them in the name of Aid and Uplifts is very little helpful? Should they be browbeaten without being really assisted with implements and tools which modern technology has placed in the hands of other peoples for upward of a century?

Foreign Aid:

In the past decade much has been said in favour of foreign aid. The present economic backwardness of Pakistan and her utter dependence of foreign supplies in vital sectors irresistably

leads us to the conclusion that there is much that is wrong and unwholesome for us in the 'aid policies of some foreign nations with whom we have dealings.

To understand this aspect of foreign Aid to Pakistan, we must take a look at global policies from which all actions of the giant Blocs proceed. Britain forms the pivot of West European Defence and is the chief ally of the United States. British economic interests require that under-developed countries should not be industrialized but should continue to be raw material producing regions. If Asian countries begin to develop their industrial potential, British exports, British prosperity and British military strengh will deteriorate. We are therefore not surprised that U.S. aid to Pakistan has been such that:

1. it has only helped to meet immediate and pressing scarcities *e.g.* foodgrain,
2. it has shifted the country's attention from mechanisation of agriculture and
3. it has increased the dependence of Pakistan on foreign imports.

In fairness it must be owned that the U.S. has no direct interest in keeping Pakistan unindustrialised exceptihg perhaps the very short-sighted one of keeping a friendly ally in day-to-day dependence on itself. But, as has been said, Britain implacably adheres to the policy of maintaining the agricultural hinterlands of her industrial empire in their traditional backwardness. On the occasion of his being recalled from Japan, General MacArthur had stated that he was opposed by the British when he tried to rebuild Japanese industrial strength as a basis of her

military preparedness. Likewise such American-sponsored projects as the European Common Market and Euratom calculated to improve West European industrial output and improve West European military potential, were vehemently opposed in Britain, since with these advantages European industrial manufactures would compete harder against British exporters in world markets. Nevetheless the U.S. could not afford to please Britain at the cost of keeping Western Europe industrially poor and backward.

In the case of Pakistan, however, the U.S. seems to have given in and agreed to help in keeping Pakistan industrailly poor and in perpetual need of British and other manufactured produce. The large number of Anglo-American experts have, through suggestion and persuasion, turned the entire currect of Pakistani development into the morass of the pre-Iron Age agriculture. The only dependable means of increasing agricultural production *viz.*, massive mechanization was avoided for indigenous manufacture of modern agricultural machinery would have resulted in modern industrial development.

The Example of India;

India would have been in much the same position as Pakistan today, had it not been for two factors. Firstly the task of building a railway net-work for the economic exploitation of this vast territory necessitated the setting up of the famous Tata Iron and Steel plant long before Independence. Secondly, India's neutral policy enabled her to accept Soviet Aid (given unerringly in the all-important steel sector). When the U.S.S.R. undertook to set up the famous million-ton Bhilai Steel Plant, all other expediency was jettisoned, and Americans, Germans and the British

rushed in with a million-ton plant each. In 1961 India will produce 8 million tons of steel and shall inexorably take her place among great powers. The potentialities of industrial expansion and military preparedness inherent in the ability of India to make 8 million tons of steel every year are simply unimaginable. Meanwhile, Indians have fallen short of achieving their food production target, but are not bothered about it. When a relatively small portion of the Indian steel output is diverted to the production of tractors (which incidentally connotes the capacity to produce tanks and armoured vehicles) Indian agricultural production will soon be in excees of Indian needs. With India forging ahead on the technological front, its importance in international councils has become incomparably greater. Other signs of the time are not lacking. India wants to import eggs, poultry and ghee from Pakistan. Shall Pakistan become an economic appendage, something of a kitchen garden, to the Indian industrial giant of a decade hence?

There can be little doubt that the economic policy of the U.S.S.R. in respect of under-developed countries has been different from that of the Western democracies. Within a few years the Chinese colossus, who had floundered for two centuries in economic helplessness, has been jerked to his feet by the most extensive programme of technological aid in history. Among other aid, the U.S.S.R. has given China the celebrated Red Brick Motor Factory, a gigantic machine-tool plant, a seamless iron-pipe factory and upward of 150 other plants and industrial units. Some idea of the size of Soviet Aid to China can be had when we consider that the number of blue-prints transferred to China by the U.S.S.R. borders upon one million. Already speculators

on the future of the world see the shadow of China falling across the unwritten pages of history.

Sentimental View:

It may be asked where shall we attack the 3rd Greatest Problem with which Pakistan is faced? What has been said above leads to doubts and misgiving about our existing policies. When all is said and done, the help that we are getting at present, is subject to the condition that we do almost nothing whatever to build up our own basic industrial potential, During the past decade we have followed a somewhat naive foreign policy and probably taken a sentimental view of such factors as straightforwardness, loyalty and friendship in international relationships. How very mistaken such a view can be has been proved to us by the recent utterances of U.S. statesmen on aid to Pakistan. There may be a reversal of policy any day and we may be left in the lurch. We have already wasted a lot of time. Before many more months pass we muct set up a steel plant and an agricultural tractor factory whether we turn to the U.S. or the Soviet Union to be able to do so. On the home-front we must go all out to strengthen the manufacture of agricultural machinery. Properly the entire question of mechanisation of agriculture should be taken up by a Ministry of Technological Advancement which should promote schools of mining and metallurgy, poly-technics and laboratories on an adequate scale and should launch forth on an extensive programme of assistance to manufacturing of irrigation pumps, oil motors and electrical power units.

Values and National Destiny

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 2nd June, 1959)

In the unremitting struggle for survival which grips all life on this planet, success or failure for individuals as well as nations depends on the ideals and objectives towards which they are driven by internal motivation.

As the living space on the earth diminishes before an exploding world population, the struggle for life becomes keener and more complex. The means of survival no longer remain such that individuals or small groups are able to mobilise them. In the present age, the combined moral and material resources of great international blocs are required for the production of such weapons as the nuclear bomb and for the organisation of effective defence against gigantic destructive forces which technology has placed at the disposal of mankind.

Basic Unit:

Individuals and small groups are lost in the vast dimensions of the modern arena. The only way for them to become effective is to be loyal and hardworking parts of big ideological and economic aggregates. Nevertheless, the individual human being retains his importance as the basic unit in all organisation. The private citizen is the brick or stone block on whose quality the efficiency and durability of the entire national structure ultimately depends.

In the anxious futre that lies before mankind, the survival of national groups will be determined by the strength of their national purpose, by their

solidarity and cohesion and by the compulsion to work which their ideals inspire. All these factors are, in the final analysis, the outcome of the character of the individual citizens and the values in life cherished by them.

The nation will go the way its individuals wish to go. Pakistan came into existence because millions of Pakistanis were inexorably opposed to domination by aliens. Each individual was impelled by a strong urge to win a homeland where he and his national group would live free from the shadow of caste, untouchability and violence by fanatical gangsters. The cohesion and fighting strength of the Pakistanis were derived from the motivational impulse emanating from the eternal values of human freedom.

Chain-reaction:

In the practical house-keeping of a community, wrong values tend to spread on the chain-reaction principle. One spendthrift makes ten others. A woman who spends half of her husband's salary on imported clothes is likely to inspire a dozen others with the desire to do the same. In Pakistan, during the past decade, a large number of people have built big houses and bought flashy motor cars because of the emotional compulsion induced in them by the example of a few individuals in places of authority and responsibility. When such a process is initiated in a vigorous and energetic people like the Pakistanis, much damage to tradition, to public morality and to national economy can occur within a relatively short time.

On the same principle, right values can be inculcated by symbolic action on the part of those who are respected and admired by virtue

of their position in the community. Japanese Generals who lived in two rooms and blackened their own boots were the foci of far reaching impulses to discipline, sacrifice and service for the entire nation. Mr. M.K. Gandhi, with his loin cloth and spare living, helped to rescue a population of 350 millions from slavery. By his practice, Mr. Gandhi showed his contempt for the base and slavish objectives of imitation of aliens and luxurious living in the midst of an impoverished population. The symbolic acts of the Caliphs of Islam, such as equal sharing of privileges and needs, changed a people divided between masters and slaves into a monolithic brotherhood who carried the doctrine of equality and justice to the farthest confines of the then known world. Professor Oppenheimer, working on the desert plateau of Los Alamos, touched off by his example a moral chain-reaction which drew thousands of Americans to the laboratories of the nuclear age.

The Choice:

In the global predicament created by the discovery of nuclear energy, the destiny of Pakistan will be determined by the values owned by the Pakistanis on a national scale. If degenerate values of ostentation, personal comfort, personal security and pleasure worship externalised in the pursuit of base symbols such as money, palaces and motor cars possess the mind of the Pakistani people the end is not difficult to predict. Their living space will be taken by groups with better ideals, and those that escape destruction will become hewers of wood and drawers of water, serfs and untouchables.

If, on the other hand, the Pakistanis live in the light of their traditions, making sacrifices for

the national good, embracing austerity, simplicity and equality, giving more to the nation than they take from it, theirs will be the honour and glory of those who have been enjoined to establish Man's viceregency of a Just and Merciful God upon the earth.

Pakistan and U. S. Economic Aid

In his address to the Iranian Parliament, President Eisenhower said that Americans could lose their freedom if they failed to co-operate in progress towards achieving the basic aspirations of humanity. The truth of this statement goes beyond the expediencies of diplmoacy or military preparedness.

There can be no doubt that only those peoples will survive who not merely own the ideal of the uplift of mankind as a whole, but actively work for its realisation. Howsoever well-armed and prosperous a nation or an association of nations may be, the inheritance of the earth will not be theirs unless their vision of human destiny embraces freedom from poverty, disease and brutalising labour for all men.

Want and misery overtook several nations of the world after the holocaust of the second global war. America lent a helping hand to a number of peoples and assisted them to rebuild their economies. A decade has since gone by and varying degrees of success have been achieved by different nations in eliminating poverty from their midst and in gaining defensive strength. For instance, the recovery in Western Europe consequent upon Marshall Aid has been miraculous. Never have Britain, West Germany, France and other West European nations seen such prosperity. Food is plentiful and varied. Modern comfortable houses have been built by the million. Other material comforts are available on an unprecedented scale.

"We never had it so good," say the Britons. The Chairman of the German Federation of Trade Unions, Mr. Willi Richter has said: "Owning a radior or T.V. set or refrigerator or washing machine is today no longer a luxury; it merely corresponds to the level of our civilisation," (*Time* Sept. 21, 1959).

Different Picture:

On the other hand, the picture is very different in under-developed countries. Pakistan lacks even food when food is taken to mean only cereal. When under-development is explained in terms of the standard of living of 90 per cent of the people, it shocks observers from advanced countries The food which the average citizen gets, the roof under which he lives, the clothes he wears are, to say the least, not compatible with human status. Much of the labour that he engages in. has a primitive and brutalising cast. He literally breaks stones with his hands and exposes his quivering flesh to the inclemency of the elements to produce trickles of what in the language of economics is called raw material.

What are the reasons for this disparity in the progress made by countries of Western Europe and Pakistan in the last decade? The ravages of war did not occur on Pakistani soil. On the other hand, much of Western Europe was systematically devastated, ploughed up by tanks, blasted by artillery and aerial bombardment, and subjected to scorched earth strategy by retreating armies. When the war ended, a certain level of economic adequacy prevailed in Pakistan, connoted by prices of commodity and appliances on the one hand, and wages on the other.

How has the peaceful reconstruction after the war, helped with U.S. money and expert advice,

affected the over-all standard of living in Pakistan? Of course there is the argument that the people of Pakistan are backward, uneducated, lacking in civic virtues, averse to hard work, etc., etc. But is it indeed so and can we explain the above disparities on that basis?

It seems that the answers must be sought in other directions. We must, all of us, Americans and Pakistanis alike, look for the answer in the interest of the survival of us all in the dark and anxious future that confronts the human race. President Eisenhower said in Teheran that freedom might be lost if efforts for co-operation aimed at concretising the basic aspirations of mankind failed. The present indications are that the Pak-American co-operation during the past decade has not been very successful in improving the basic condition of living for the millions in Pakistan. The situation is tersely summed up in *Time* of Dec. 21, 1959 (Pacific Edition); "That while the U.S. and Europe increasingly enjoy the good life, many nations outside the Communist bloc are getting more populous and relatively poorer." With the future at stake we must face the problem squarely or drift inevitably to the doom which Nature has ordained for the vanquished.

A Market for Europe:

It will be helpful if we study the differences in the American aid programme to West Europe and Pakistan. It will be observed that in the over-all picture of co-operation in the Free World, the place assigned to Pakistan has been that of a producer of raw materials and a market for West European manufactured produce. This by itself would perhaps not be very alarming if the process had been kept within natural limits. But a nation

of 90 million has certain inexorable needs which it must meet by the development of its own resources. We are living in the Iron Age and an irreducible minimum of engineering industry and basic mechanical technology is absolutely essential even for a nation which is to be integrated into an international bloc as a producer of raw materials and a market for finished goods.

Today, all wealth is machinery, from fountain pens and watches to locomotives and ocean liners. To proceed on the assumption that a nation with almost half the population of the U.S. can import all of its machinery amounts to saying that all its wealth shall be brought to it from abroad. Virtually this has been the blueprint on which everybody has been working during the past decade.

Should we be surpised then that today Pakistan is dependent on imports as she has never been before? And should we doubt that unless the direction of present development is modified, she will become more and more dependent upon foreign supplies as time passes? How has this big lacuna come to exist in Pakistan's economy? It has not been accidental but has resulted from certain powerful causes. Before we make an attempt to remove them we must dispassionately and objectively understand the manner in which they have been operating.

For over a century Pakistan was subjected to political domination by the British who developed it as a producer of raw materials and a market for British manufactured goods. To keep agricultural labour effective, they introduced health measures like malaria control. They built roads and railways to bring all parts of the country in the orbit of their economic policy. They emphasised agriculture and allied activity. Science in Pakistan

during the British period meant botany, entomology and animal husbandry. Social development meant rural uplift. The achievements of modern engineering were in the main canal headworks. Applied economics was confined to rural co-operatives. Vocational bias in high schools was translated in practice as addition of an agriculture class. State subsidy for industry took the shape of aided cattle farms. The vision of national service took concrete form as planting trees and building roads. The application of modern science to national production took the form of introduction of the Raja plough, crossing of local breeds of cattle with Ayrshire and Jersey strains, import of white Leghorn and Rhode Island chickens, etc.

While they emphasised agriculture in every way, the British were careful not to let engineering and other modern industry take root in Pakistan. Even the mechanisation of agriculture was avoided, for the manufacture of tractors and trucks would have brought real industry to this region. From their viewpoint they were quite right in this, for the natural skill of the people along with low wages of workers would have caused Pakistani goods to under-sell British products not only in Pakistan but perhaps in other markets as well. (The example of Japan served as a warning). Having complete political and military control of the region, they were able to reduce local industrial manufacture almost to the point of extinction. The tiny pockets that remained in Sialkot, Wazirabad, Peshawar and elsewhere never offered any serious competition to the British exporter. Since the skill, industry and ingenuity of the Pakistani artisan are sometimes questioned, it is only fair to add that common varieties of Wazirabad cutlery and Sialkot sports goods were and today are among the least expensive articles of their quality in the entire world.

British Policy:

As a result of this policy, Britain achieved the highest level of prosperity among the countries of Europe while her Asian colonies remained on the other extreme. The average life expectency in India and Pakistan during the British period was among the lowest in the world . Infant mortality was the highest. In proportion as they were able to industrialise, other nations of Europe and Asia improved their standards of living. Conditions all over the world, without any exception whatever, indicated that prosperity and defensive strength were directly proportional to the level of industrialisation. The British economic policy in the colonies was not defensible from the point of view of this universal economic fact. Consequently, a new and essentially incorrect economic philosophy was devised for its justification.

The main features of this philosophy were: Industrialisation was good but every country in the world was not suited for it. Pakistan and India were intended by Nature to be agricultural. They had little coal or iron. Their inhabitants were unsuited for industrial occupations. The climate, customs, traditions, attitude, religion, social conventions, in short, every human and environmental factor proved that the people of these regions should keep to agriculture. The moment you looked at a map of the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent you knew that the rivers were intended by Nature for canal irrigation. The Indo-Gangetic plain was intended to be ploughed. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this philosophy was that it sought to keep even agriculture in the pre-Iron-Age grooves. Mechanisation of agriculture, *i.e.*, providing power units for water-lifts, tractors, trucks, could have

been brought about only if these appliances were made in the country. This would have irresistibly brought in real industry like steel and mechanical engineering. Consequently, it was said that mechanisation was unsuited for conditions in Asian countries. The bullock cart was the ideal transport. Tractor-ploughing had 'failed.' The Asian cultivator must beat starving cattle yoked to the medieval plough for hours upon hours. Almost a third of the land continued to be under fodder crops. Blind-folded oxen went round and round, working creaking Persian wheels for days and nights, producing a trickle of water while the driver was stupefied riding the eternal round. On lakhs of farms even today all the work team of oxen can do is to raise hardly enough water and plough an area which helps to raise their fodder crop and yield the barest subsistence for the owner's family. Yet, so powerful is the hold of the century-old philosophy that even today certain people argue against mechanisation and the upshot is that Pakistan continues to have a food shortage, when food is taken to mean only wheat and rice.

Nationalist Opposition:

Progressive nationalists in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent were opposed to this economic philosophy, but it was so assiduously fostered by vast governmental organisations, including the education, village uplift, co-operation and health departments, that millions knew of none other. Over the course of decades this economic thought permeated every department of the Government and an entire system of official terminology sprang up which seemed to lend inexorable sanction to it. Officials, privileged functionaries of the Imperial Power, who were concerned with its implementation, came to believe in it wholly or in part. It

was the residuum of this economic thought among the functionaries of the administration which contributed materially to the continuance of old tendencies and acceptance of foreign plans which had been energetically influenced by Britain and as such corresponded to the pre-Independence pattern.

To understand the manner in which foreign co-operation has, in the main, been put in the old economic grooves, we need to take a look at the global political and strategic background.

Even before the Second World War formally ended, the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union had come to the fore in world affairs. The occupation of Eastern Europe by Soviet troops resulted in vast accretions of industrial and armament potential to the Soviet Union. The devastated economy of Western Europe and the resultant want and poverty among its inhabitants threatened to drive these countries into the Communist fold. The U.S. very rightly decided to render vast economic aid to the countries of Western Europe under the Marshall Plan. Accordingly, one of the miracles of modern times was wrought and the shattered economies of France, West Germany, Italy and other West European countries were rebuilt in a manner for which a parallel hardly existed. Within a decade immense prosperity surged back into Western Europe.

With its industry reconstructed, West Europe regained its defensive strength. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation combined the defensive capabilities of Britain, France, West Germany and other European nations. Both from the point of view of technological resources as well as man-power, the European members of

N.A.T.O. are strong enough to withstand Soviet aggression. After Marshall Aid reconstruction and N.A.T.O. co-ordination, the West European industrial and technological complex is today so vast that manufacture of space and nuclear weapons can be based upon it. The six-Nation Common Market and Euratom, the West European Nuclear Energy Co-operation, sponsored by the United States, have further strengthened the technological and industrial matrix of the N.A.T.O. countries. The level of prosperity in these countries is high enough to be passionately defended by the inhabitants against any onslaught by Communism.

British Influence:

Britain is the key-stone of West European defence and the greatst ally of the U.S. British industry escaped destruction by foreign armies of occupation and was immensely strengthened by the Marshall Plan. Britain has also taken an energetic and highly influential interest in U.S. policies in Asia and Africa. The result has been that American aid has not changed the pre-war status of Pakistan and certain other erstwhile colonies of Britain as markets and producers of raw material. Occupying as she does, a pivotal position in West European defence against the Soviet Union. British influence with the United States Government must be very great indeed. Britain disapproved of the rebuilding of the industry of her European competitors but could not very well stand in the way of the U.S. policy in this regard. With strong Communist parties in France and Italy, U.S. could not afford to give weight to the grumbling of British financial and manufacturing interests against the rehabilitation of their industry. In the case of her erstwhile colonies, however, British in£uence must have

been compelling. Britain could not have looked upon the industrialisation of her market countries with equanimity and U.S. aid policies must have been modified accordingly. The vast difference in U.S. approach to the problem of economic assistance to European countries on the one hand, and to countries like Pakistan on the other cannot be explained on any other basis except that there has been a consistent effort to keep these countries, unindustrialised. Whatever be the operating factors in the background and whatever the means or motives, one is constrained to observe that after the war, the United States aid and advice has succeeded in re-establishing of the same kind of economic relationship between West European countries on the one hand and Asian countries on the other as existed when the latter were political dependencies of the former.

This process has assumed an aggravated shape in Pakistan since Pakistan has admitted U.S. consultation in her affairs more extensively perhaps than any other Asian country. There are thousands of U.S. advisers, consultants, experts, cultural officers, missionaries, educationists and engineers in the country and their advice is usually accepted. There is hardly a development project of any size in the country which does not have a foreign aid component the utilisation of which is closely supervised by foreign agencies. U.S. advisers are associated with planning at almost all levels. It would not, therefore, be unfair to say that the responsibility for the present economic conditions rests very largely with the U.S. (It cannot of course be denied that the penultimate responsibility lies with Pakistan herself for uncritically co-operating with the United States).

Neutral Countries:

It is difficult to avoid a comparison with those countries which have followed a more neutralist

course than Pakistan. An instance in point is India. While Pakistan, with the help of U.S. and British advisers and experts is struggling to increase cereal production with the pre-Iron-Age kind of agriculture, India has increased her steel production four-fold. American, British and German help in the all-important steel sector followed only when the Soviet Union moved in with the celebrated Bhilai steel plant scheduled to produce a million tons of steel every year. India will produce a colossal eight million tons of steel in 1961 and will inexorably become a modern Power. A thousand industries will spring from steel, including the vital motor industry, the initial stages of which have already been covered. With moderate mechanisation of agriculture she will easily meet her food requirements (with non-mechanised agriculture in Pakistan one man cannot produce food for two while with complete mechanisation in America one agricultural worker produces food for 22). Immense defensive strength will accrue to India when the Indian steel begins to flow into her sinews of war.

Other neutralist countries who have effected vast improvement in their economies are Egypt, Iraq and Afghanistan. They have all taken Soviet help in the capital sector and Egypt has set up a steel plant. Egypt is far smaller than Pakistan but Soviet aid has caused her to take an economic leap which is almost phenomenal. During Nasser's regime, Egypt has raised her industrial output by 74 per cent and agricultural produce by 14 per cent. Egypt is making and selling abroad tyres, radios, refrigerators, washing machines and and the like. Motor trucks and tractors have started coming off the production lines. The steel factory is producing 2,50,000 tons of steel every year (*Life International*, Aug. 17, 1959). These conditions are sometimes made the basis for

the suggestion that if Pakistan had been less closely aligned with the U.S., she could perhaps have set up heavy industry like steel and motor manufacture with Soviet help and would have been able to face the future with far greater confidence than she can today. The critics of the Western demorcacies sometimes say that while the U.S. is, to all intents and purposes, trying to integrate Asian and African countries into the democratic bloc as markets and raw material producing hinterlands for Western Europe, the Russians are following an opposite policy. The Soviet Union aims at making the under-developed countries self-sufficient by helping them to set up real industry and thereby making them economically independent of the colonial Powers.

Soviet Influence:

Mr. Edward Crankshaw writing in *Life International* of July 6, 1959, announces "Russia Wages Economic War. Battleground: India's Plains, Shores of Nile." Mr. Crankshaw highlights the Soviet-built steel mill at Bhilai, India. He argues that the under-developed countries are deeply impressed with Russians' willingness to help them in the heavy industry sector. It is apparent that the only means of counteracting this influence is to provide the bare minimum of heavy industry to countries like Pakistan who have been consistent and unwavering partisans of the United States. If Pakistan had been a neutral she would most probably have received Soviet assistance precisely in the sector in which U.S. aid has missed her, *viz.*, steel, motor-vehicles and other heavy industry, for the lack of which superficial industrial development is making her more and more precariously dependent upon foreign countries.

It has now become necessary that U.S. aid to Pakistan be given a new turn. Pakistan should

be able to build for herself a certain minimum of steel, motor-vehicles and other hardware without which life cannot be imagined in the 20th century. Pakistan cannot possibly hope to pay for the machinery which she can just not do without in the Iron-Age, by raising agricultural produce. The prices of raw material have gone far down and the prices of manufactured articles have been raised high by the manufacturing countries.

Reorientation:

It should be possible to start a reorientation on these lines straightaway. In fact, some of the projects already in hand can be given a new turn. For instance, Pakistan has one of the best-equipped railway workshops in Asia which employs thousands. These workshops can build anything in the way of railway equipment, including locomotives. There is no justification, therefore, in giving Pakistan coaches and readymade material. The 50 million dollar aid to Railways should come in the shape of another Railway workshop. It is lathes, shaping machines, cranes, furnaces and drills that Pakistan needs. She has the experience and the know-how to make her locomotive and carriages herself.

Much of Pakistan's agriculture depends on methods which belong to the pre-Iron-Age. Such things as sugar-cane presses, transport carts, Persian wheels are still being made of wood. Their efficiency is terribly low compared to current standards the world over. We need to give our cultivators such things as troughs, wheel-barrows, iron-piping, fodder-cutters, water-pumps, carts with steel axles and rubber-tyres by the million. Without indigenous manufacture this cannot possibly be done. A good line for Village-AID would be to establish mechanical servicing centres

for tube-wells, power-operating pumps, rubber-tyre wagons, steel sugar-cane presses tractors and trucks everywhere. The cultivator must be made machine-minded: else the vision of agricultural prosperity will largely remain unrealised.

Second Five-Year Plan–A Critical Appraisal

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 25th & 26th January, 1960*)

The President has called upon the people to study the Second Five-Year Plan and comment upon it constructively. How very important this is, will be realised when we remind ourselves that no group of people can implement a big project like the Plan unless a considerable section among them understands the why and wherefore of its main outlines.

Time-limit plans like a Five-Year Plan have in modern times been adopted by countries trying to catch up with advanced nations. The country most successful with this kind of plan has been the Soviet Union and recently China and India. Forty years ago Russia contained some of the most backward regions and peoples in the world afflicted with abject economic misery. By planning her economy, she is today bidding for world domination. China's economic reconstruction started a few years ago and already several Western observers have predicted that she may one day dominate the globe. India has emerged as a modern Power through her economic planning and is builing armoured vehicles, trucks, tractors and bombers. Thus the entire concept of a planned economy has been tried out on a scale and in various contexts which should provide us as reliable a hypothesis of planned progress for under-developed countries as there can be in this universe of chance and design.

What is the hypothesis that emerges from the operation of dozens of time-limit plans in various

parts of the world? The hypothesis is that all economies are built from the base upwards. In modern times the base means metal and engineering industry, machine tools, earth-moving equipment like bulldozers, traclors, motor vehicles, iron-piping and the like. A big nation like Pakistan must make these for herself. No foreign aid or purchase can give her enough of this kind of hardware year after year.

The Five-Year Plans, which in less than 40 years gave Russia fantastic power and civilised living to her rapidly-expanding population, were all based on the idea of priority for heavy industry. Most Russian education was, and today is, scientific and technological. The Russians trained men to build and operate machines.

Chinese Progress:

Almost one-fourth of living humanity in China had grovelled in misery and poverty for 200 years. Within a decade the Chinese have been raised to their feet by the most extensive technical and industrial aid programme in the history of mankind. Here is the *Reader's Digest* version of Robert Guillain's article, "What I saw Inside Red China" written for the *Saturday Evening Post*. "One morning in Harbin, which was already an industrial city. I was taken to a new factory. I was startled to see a long row of very modern workshops, each containing what must have been some of the newest types of Soviet-made machines for producing precision instruments and cutting tools. I knew that Moscow was supporting the Chinese Five-Year Plan and had undertaken to guide its key projects, but I had not expected to find such an impressive show place in old Harbin. Across the street I found myself submerged in another sea of Soviet machines, this time for a

flax mill. Every machine was stamped 'Made in U.S.S.R.

"A few days later I was shown the most impressive Russianbuilt factory of them all—the ornate, red-brick Automobile Factory No. 1 in Changchun, still in the process of being equipped. Here I was told, that the first automobile ever completely manufactured in China would soon come from the assembly lines. This factory is entirely Russian except for the workers who are Chinese.

"In Anshan to the wouth, I visited a rolled-steel mill, a seamless-tube factory and automatic blast furnaces. The Chinese who showed me around explained that the equipment is wholly Russian, installed by Russian technicians. A Belgian industrialist, after visiting the seamless-tube factory told me. 'Some of this equipment is better than anything we have in Europe, and I suspect the Russians have very little in use which is so up-to-date. You probably would have to go to the United States to find anything better...'

"Later, travelling through other parts of China, I found that Russian equipment, technique and help had gone into every important project. That was true of the giant open coal mines and the aluminium works at Fushun, of the huge oil refinery near Lanchow, of the hydro-electric plant in Chunking, of the great Yangtze River Bridge at Hankow....and of the big paper mill in Canton....A high official in Peking said, that all the 156 projects which are the backbone of the Five-Year Plan depend on Russian technology. The Plan itself has been largely shaped by Russian consultants."

The above extract should give some idea of the nature and scope of a Five-Year Plan which

has caused some Western thinkers to believe that in a future war Russia will join the U.S. to fight the Chinese colossus.

India's Advance:

Nearer home there is India. Here is an extract from the article *The Battle of the Mills* in the Pacific Edition of the U.S. Weekly *Time* (February 9, 1959): "Prime Minister Nehru deplores the trend towards 'giganticism' in modern industrial society, but when it comes to his own economy, he flatly says: 'We must think in terms of large schemes.'" The article goes on to say that the new steel mills "represent the chief hope of India's shaky economy." Within a period of three years (by 1961) Indian steel production will go up 400 per cent.

Thus we see that economic development has meant the development of heavy industry. Viewed from this angle, Pakistan's Second Five-Year Plan is very different. It mainly envisages agricultural development on the basis of improving irrgation and seeds and bringing new land under cultivation. If we are to proceed on generalisations emerging from the history of successful plans in other countries, this Plan cannot be expected to yield the results other plans have yielded elsewhere. The mainstay of Russian, Chinese and Indian Plans *viz.*, heavy industry, is absent from this Plan.

Enlarged Replica:

On the other hand, this Plan is an enlarged replica of the First Five-Year Plan about which the summary of the Second Plan released at Rawalpindi says that "There has been practically no increase in *per capita* income during the First

Plan period." This tallies with the hypothesis that basic industry alone can effect economic improvement. As in the Second Plan, heavy industry was absent from the First and agriculture had the highest priority. Other headings of the two Plans are indetical and the proportions of various allocations are substantiality the same. In fact, the increase under "Industry. Fuels and Minerals" is proportionally the smallest, which means that the Second Plan lays even less emphasis on this heading. The logical conclusion would be that the Second Plan like its prototype, will produce similar results and improvement in the *per capita* income will not be considerable. Let us be sure that in hoping for a 10 per cent increase in the *per capita* income, as a result of the Second Plan, we are taking into account all the inexorable cause-and-effect relationships of economics. In the words of the released summary: "The strategy of the Plan is to consolidate the achievement of the First Plan. . . ." We have started certain projects and have invested our resources and five years of our lives in the Fist Plan, yet our *per capita* income has not risen. Here is a quotation from the Pacific Edition of *Time* (December 21, 1959) under the heading "The Nations:" "Out of a welter of confusion, inertia, committee meetings and high-minded oratory, three propositions last week seemed to be taking shape:

"That while the U.S. and Europe increasingly enjoy the good life, many nations outside the Communist bloc are getting more populous and relatively poorer. . . .

"That someone ought to provide focus, plans and machinery for all the scattered remedie that so far have not been extensive enough, or inspiringly imaginative or outstandingly successful."

Basic Shortcoming:

This is a very recent statement and was made after the Second Plan was devised. In fact, the Second Plan may be said to belong to the period to which the above statement refers. If we take into account the wages, prices and actual living conditions today, we shall be inclined to agree that Pakistan is one of those countries "outside the Communist bloc" which are getting "relatively poorer." This is the result of the First Five-Year Plan to which the Second Plan is analogous and of which it forms a sequel. Clearly, there has been something wrong and inadequate in the First Plan. The Second Plan is so very like the First and in fact pursues its policies so closely that we would be justified in having misgivings about its outcome. As has been already stated, the Pakistan Plans have been very unlike the successful time-limit Plans of other nations. The fundamental difference is the lack of engineering and other heavy industry in the Pakistan Plans. An obvious improvement would be to provide a certain minimum of it.

On the other hand, we must again take stock of our past projects and wind up those which have been less productive. That we have already spent much money on some of them is no reason why we should continue with them if they have been unfruitful. How can we justify a policy or project the net result of which after five years is poverty?

It is open to debate whether the means suggested by the Second Plan for increasing agricultural production are indeed those that Pakistan should adopt. These are based on bringing more area under cultivation and improvement in seed, etc. The region of mechanical efficiency

has been left untouched. In actual fact this is precisely the direction in which increased effort is required.

Today much of the agricultural equipment in Pakistan has some of the lowest efficiency in the world. For instance, the wooden bullock-cart, or the heavy wooden components of the Persian wheel are so cumbersome as to leave a very small margin of mechanical advantage. One should have thought that the first thing to strike the observer would be the imperative need for quick substitution of this antediluvian equipment with iron and steel implements. Some idea of the importance of the use of metal implements and tools in our rural economy will be had if we imagine for a moment that the millions of kerosene oil containers now used by villagers for all imaginable purposes are suddenly taken from them. The waste, inefficiency and storage difficulties caused by the disappearance of this simple container can hardly be imagined. Likewise, the substitution of the revolving fodder cutter with the old style chopper would cause an increase in manual labour and deterioration of livestock welfare. These simple instance have been given to show that minor improvements in agricultural equipment based on engineering can lead to considerable increase in output.

Poor Output:

In America, where there is complete mechanisation, one agricultural worker produces food for 22 persons. In Pakistan, where mechanisation has been avoided, 60 million agricultural workers cannot grow enough food for a population of 90 million. The U.S. has had a glut of agricultural produce so that Mr. Rockefeller advocates the withdrawal of 50 million acres of

land from cultivation and putting it under forest. From conditions in America it might have been suggested that in vast areas of Pakistan where the only metal tools are tiny hoes and scythes, some small measure of mechanisation might be attemped, but, strangely enough, this aspect of improvement is hardly ever mentioned. It is reasonable to suppose that if just five per cent of the mechanisation obtaining in the U.S.A. was introduced in Pakistan, agricultural production would be doubled, or trebled without the addition of a single acre. None of this mechanisation, however, can be introduced without basing it on an engineering industry in the country itself. Our agriculture is straining to adopt mechanical improvements and village smithies are making with primitive tools such things as revolving steel fodder cutters, sugar-cane crushers, water lifts and the like; but they have not received any assistance. The village black-smith and metal worker is the single artisan who has been neglected in the past hundred years during which Britain sought to convert this area into an agricultural appendage of her vast industrial empire.

Temporary Gain:

In broad outline, the Second Plan envisages the installation of about 5,000 tube-wells and provision of transport and communication and other mechanical equipment without which it is impossible to develop an area even as a raw material producing region. Pakistan is a very big country with more than half the population of the United States. Even though we may seek to expand our agriculture on the lines of the Second Five-Year Plan, the mechanical component of this development will still be considerable. Are we justified in basing our planning on importing as aid or buying this mechanical component abroad?

Shall we be able to maintain it on an efficient level without indigenous engineering? Unless we have our own engineering industry, it will only be a temporary gain and will increase our dependence on foreign imports of machinery.

As a result of our water dispute with India we have adopted a vast programme of canal links and the like. Its cost has been estimated at Rs. 400 crore. In our Second Plan we should have made provision for the manufacture of some small part of the huge mechanical component of this canal link project.

One of the "principal goals" of the Second Plan, is "to improve the balance of payments position by increasing foreign exchange earning by 20 per cent." If this is proposed to be done by raising agricultural produce, this hope may fall short of fulfilment. During the past 20 years the prices of manufactured goods and machinery have risen much faster than the prices of agricultural commodities. The Budget white paper issued by the Government of Pakistan expressly states this: "While the highly industrialised countries have been improving their economies by raising the prices of their manufactured goods, the economies of rawmaterial exporting countries like Pakistan have suffered." Unless there is a reversal in world trends, the existing tendencies indicate that the discrepancy in prices of manufactured products and agricultural raw materials will become more unfavourable for Pakistan. The only way in which Pakistan can balance her trade is by making some of the machinery and manufactured goods herself. To achieve this in any considerable degree, she must in some small measure begin making the base on which industry can be built. The Plan

provides us no indication that this will be attempted.

It has been stated that the Plan will "prepare the country for a great advance in agriculture which will pave the way for an industrial revolution." Industry and agriculture are complementary, and efficiency in agriculture cannot be achieved without a minimum amount of basic industry. The problem of Pakistani agriculture is the problem of efficient production and hardly any other. This calls for immediate engineering support for agriculture. It is questionable if basic and real industrialisation should be postponed any further.

Heavy Industry:

Industry has been neglected in the Second Plan which promises increase of only 50 per cent in large-scale industry and 10 per cent in small-scale industry. The amount of "large-scale industry" in the country is small; and 50 per cent of a small quantity is very small. Then, "large-scale industry" in the country is not heavy engineering industry, which is the kind of industry Pakistan needs most. Again, small-scale industry must be based on and untilise the products of heavy industry which, judged from modern standards, is almost non-existent in Pakistan. Modern small-scale industry untilises materials like nylon, plastic, iron and copper sheets, wire, chemicals, dyes and other products of heavy industry. Above all, small-scale industry needs machines and tools which heavy engineering alone can produce. Let us consider again if small-scale industry based on imported material and imported machine tools will be an economic proposition for Pakistan.

It was expected that power development provided in the Plan would take the country

forward on the path of industrialisation, but there are certain features which decrease this expectation. Only 181,000 kw., or about one-seventh of the total power production, is proposed to be used for industry. Some existing power-producing units are to be scrapped for reasons of economy, which means that overall increase in power production will be less than the apparent figures.

Key to Problem:

A study of why the Fist Five-Year Plan has not been very successful will repay Pakistani economists and administrators more than any other economic study. Europe at the present moment is so prosperous that the like of it has never been seen in history. How is it that Pakistan is as poor as she was s decade ago? Perhaps the same factors and policies which have helped to create European prosperity have contributed to create the opposite conditions in Pakistan. The First Plan was devised with foreign help and expert advice and was based on much foreign aid. The Second Plan has also been formulated with foreign consultation and guidance and depends on aid. Not only that, it is closely modelled on the First Plan and is in broad features indentical with it. Let us be sure that we have been sufficiently critical of the friendly guidance and aid of which the summary of the Second Plan released from Rawalpindi speaks so hopefully. Discussing the aid policy which the rich and prosperous European countries should follow henceforth towards less fortunate nations the *Economists* of December 12, 1959, has the following sentence: "A much less sensible advance would be for each (European) country to set up Eximbanks (Export and Import Banks) of its own, making tied loans to help its own exporters in a new wave of trade offensives masked as aid."

It is in the expression "wave of trade offensives masked as aid" that the key to the problem of the First Five-Year Plan will be found. It may also help us to understand our Second Five-Year Plan better.

The Second Five-Year Plan: Facing the Facts

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 12th March, 1960*)

While placing the Second Plan objectives before the nation on 23rd July, 1959, the President of Pakistan used the following memorable words:

"Successful planning must be an exercise in realism. The intrusion of wishful thinking must necessarily be resisted. If the past has not produced what was hoped for, no good will come from blinking that fact. . .Some factors which led to unsatisfactory performance were outside our control; others were well within it. Both must be recognised as such, examined carefully and assessed critically."

These are golden words. There is hope and strength in them. The spirit of freedom breathes through them. A people who act by these words, will go forward and will not be stopped. If, instead of careful examination and critical assessment, we take refuge in evasions and compromises and hide from hard and rugged reality behind expressions of vain hopefulness, nothing will help us. The mistakes of honest and sincere patriots will, in the final analysis, do less harm than the compromises of clever but timid minds.

The outline of the Second Five-Year Plan is before us. Let us dig under its roots and see for ourselves what is weak and what is strong. If there is something that is weak, but we must adopt it for there is no other way, let us know it for what it really is and not call it strong. If we

have to adopt certain policies which we do not really like, let us not pretend that we like them.

In our critical examination, let there be no blaming of anyone and no calling of names. We are too busy trying to get ahead to do that. All of us—planners as well as critics—are pulling the same way.

The assumption that lies behind Pakistani plans is that Pakistan is an agricultural country. To be an agricultural country is not so good as to be an industrial country. Not very long ago, all countries were agricultural. How was it that Pakistan remained agricultural while several other countries became industrial? The reasons lie in its history.

Agricultural Accent:

For over a hundred years the areas comprised in Pakistan were under British political domination. The British developed these regions for the production of raw material for their industry and as markets for their manufactured produce. The result was great prosperity in Britain and great poverty in the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. The British evolved an economic philosophy which propagated that under-developed countries were agricultural and must remain so far a long time. The economists of the sub-continent, on the other hand, said that they should, could and must industrialise. The British implemented their policy and emphasised irrigation, rural uplift, village co-operatives, tree-planting, conservation of manure, distinction between agriculturists and non-agriculturists, agriculture classes in schools, stock-breeding, etc., etc. For a hundred years, the British administrative machinery planned and worked to make of this country a vast agricultural

farm with good roads and railways to take out raw material and bring in British exports. A strong remnant of the agricultural accent in the thought and action of the administration persists up to this day.

After the 2nd World War, the U.S. built up West European industrial strength and prosperity as a basis of defence against the Soviet Union. Britain has been the chief ally of the U.S. The British interest demanded that the regions which had traditionally been British markets and raw-material producing areas, should remain so. Consequently when the U.S. moved into Asia to save its poverty-stricken millions from going into the orbit of Communism, it brought aid to Asian countries but not such aid as would industrialise them. If the countries which produce raw materials for Western Europe and serve as markets for its finished products, became economically self-sufficient, the West European alliance of N.A T.O. countries would be economically and militarily weakened. It is, therefore, understandable that the U.S. aid to under-developed countries should be such as would keep them agricultural.

Bhilai Plant:

On the other hand, the Soviet Union has diamentrically opposite policy and aims. Wherever it can, the Soviet Union gives the under-developed countries steel and other heavy industry so that they should become economically independent of Western Europe. In India the Soviet Union set up the million ton steel plant at Bhilai. (The U.S., Britain and West Germany rushed in with three more plants to give the Russians competition. The Indians obligingly accepted all four and acquired a powerful base for industry, modernisation of agriculture, military strength and prosperity). Likewise, the U.S.S.R. aided real and

basic industry in Egypt, China and elsewhere. Let us see how the Pakistani development plans have fared so far in this welter of gigantic forces of the cold war and what is the logical shape of the future.

We continue to avoid the expression "failed" when speaking of the First Plan and take refuge behind phrases like "insufficient progress in several sectors." We even claim "substantial progress." in other sectors. These other sectors turn out to be mainly "residential constructions" which means non-productive investment. We are a soveriegn people, master in our own homeland. We do not owe apologies to anyone. We made our First Plan and we implemented it. We are responsible for the outcome. Our First Plan has failed and let us own it. And let us not blame each other.

We had hoped for a 7.5 per cent increase in per capita income. Actually our per capita income has fallen. With the national income the case is similar. We had expected to increase foodgrain production by 9 per cent but there was no increase in food production. We increased the acreage under food by a million and a half but the yield per acre went down. The number of workers is increasing faster than the jobs available in the country. Prices have risen. Inflation has increased.

We are facing this failure boldly and our morale is high, but we must fully realise the extent of our loss. When a Five-Year Plan fails in these terms, it is a national disaster. This makes the question, Why has our First Plan failed? a most important study. In studying this question we must be realistic, bold and really blunt. The President has give the lead. He has been most explicit. Let us not fail him for this question affects our survival.

How has the failure of the First Plan been explained? Firstly, there is the argument that our administration was poor. The question is what percentage of the big shortfalls all around can we ascribe to this reason? Economic processes are logical cause-and-effect patterns. When the Plan was made, our foreign advisers were with us and helped to determine its priorities. The official documents of that period make the most hopeful reading. They are scientific and methodical. Again, during the past fifteen months there has been unquestionable improvement in administration, application, alertness and the will to work for national betterment. Have our efforts in this regard halted adverse economic trends? Has the upward climb in prices stopped? Let us be very sure that we are not giving the factor of poor administration undue prominence for by so doing the real reasons may be obscured from view.

The second feature of the First Plan is failure to increase food production. Let us get our thinking straight on this. This is not a reason for our unsuccess; it is a part of our failure. The First Plan was designed, in keeping with the wishes of our foreign advisers, to increase food and other crop production. Our cash crop production fell short of Plan figures and our food production, expected to rise by 9 per cent acutally went down.

This happened despite the fact that the area under foodgrains went up by the huge extent of one and a half million acres. We broke over half a million acres of new land which had not been cultivated before. The Grow More Food campaign was launched with full vigour. Over thirty agricutural schemes pertaining to fertilisers, irrigation, land reclamation, grain storage, agricultural organisation, soilsurvey, demonstration

farms, anti-water-logging, improvement in poultry, anti-pest measures, afforestation, agricultural marketing, livestock, etc., etc. were taken up and many of them fully or almost fully implemented. The only aspect of agriculture which went unheeded was the improvement in agricultural tools and machinery which would require a sizeable steel and engineering industry to support it. The implementation of dozens of these schemes absorbed a large measure of the energies of the people and Government of Pakistan. Under these circumstances it is not possible to ascribe the big shortfall in first Plan targets to avoidable inefficiency. We are obliged to conclude that there were basic errors in the Plan, and that the picture of the economic complex which the planners sought to project under the guidance of foreign experts contained serious gaps and insufficiencies. The First Plan was based on an Economic philosophy and its scientific methodology. When a big nation with more than half the population of the U.S. expends its energies and resources for a period of five years and becomes worse off than before, its planners must question the economic postulates and the economic guidance which they have so far owned.

The Second Plan:

In broad outline, the Second Plan is almost exactly similar to the First Plan. The Plan headings are virtually identical. There is the same emphasis on agriculture, the same heavy allocations for irrigation, the same reticence concerning replacement of antediluvian agricultural tools with more efficient metal implements; the same neglect of basic and heavy industry, and the same assumption of indefinite dependence on foreign imports. The Second Plan is to all intents and purposes, the First Plan enlarged one and a half times

involving a total expenditure of 1,900 crores as compared to 1,160 crores of the First Plan. If the First Plan has fallen short of achieving its targets and has, in fact, resulted in a drop in the per capita income, it is merely logical to suppose that the Second Plan will not produce very different results.

In order to discover the deficiences in the Pakistani Plans we should compare them with the successful time-limit Plans of other nations. By planning, the Soviet Union has, within the space of forty years progressed from almost medival backwardness to fantastic power. China, after centuries of abject misery, has, through planning, built up an economic base which has caused Western thinkers to predict that she will dominate the world. India has raised her per capita income by four per cent, is producing defence equipment, motor vehicles and bombers and is on the way to becoming a modern power.

Common Factor:

The common factor in the economic progress of these countries is the emphasis on heavy industry which is the root and base on which all other progress, prosperity, industry and production including agricultural production, rests. I have in my previous article "The Second Five-Year Plan: A critical Appraisal" in the 25th and 26th January issues of *The Pakistan Times quoted* at length from the *Reader's Digest* version (September, 1956) of Robert Guillain's article "What I saw inside Red China." From this article it appears that the Soviet Union has, with dramatic abruptness, planted heavy industry on the vastest scale on Chinese soil. The Chinese Five-Year Plan is built on the concept of highest priorities for

heavy industry. We, on the other hand, have ignored heavy and basic industry like steel and heavy engineering. No heavy engineering industry was set up in the Fist Plan period and if the Second Plan is implemented on the present lines, we shall be almost as far from having basic and heavy industry in 1965 as we were in 1951 when the Six-Year Plan period began. (The Six-Year Plan was given up in 1955 and the First Five-Year Plan was adopted instead).

Let us analyse how the First Five-Year Plan has brought about a fall in our national income. Our development or rather the change which the passage of time has inexorably brought, is causing us to use more and more of those mechanical appliances which are, in the final analysis, the products of heavy industry. We are using more bicycles, more telephones, more cars and trucks, more iron piping, more machines for small industry and more of innumberable other manufactured articles and goods. If we put up small scale industry like making bicycles or telephones, our gain is partial, for the wire, steel tubing, plastic material, etc. are again imported. Thus our development makes us more and more dependent upon industrial countries who raise the prices of manufactured produce while the prices of agricultural raw material continue to be low. Under these conditions, if we expand acreage and put in national effort on a big scale to gain a margin of increase in our agricultural produce, our increased agricultural production may actually buy less of machinery like trucks, locomotives, buses and similar hardware which even a poor nation finds necessary in the 20th century. Without real, basic heavy industry like steel and engineering, an agricultural country might go far and fare worse.

Superficial development might make a country economically worse off. Superficial development causes an increase in the consumption of those chemical and mechanical products which are ultimately created by heavy industry. This demand can become strong enough in an agricultural country to force it to raise and export cash crops, and even sell abroad the food it needs for home consumption in order to import foreign industrial products. When that happens, much privation and hardship is suffered by the agricultural millions.

In order to step up the supply of agricultural raw material from agricultural countries in its sphere of influence, an alliance of advanced countries may sometimes invest in superficial development of the agricultural countries. This is the meaning of the expression "wave of trade offensives masked as aid" used by the British Weekly *Economist* in the first article of its 12th December, 1959, issue entitled "For trade and aid."

Problem of Groth:

Our greatest need of the moment is the understanding of our problem of development. So far, we have based our economic planning on the philosophy of British and other Western economists who do not visualise economic self-sufficiency for under-developed countries. We cannot live on that economic philosophy any longer but must evolve an independent economic philosophy for ourselves. We cannot borrow Soviet economic philosophy, for our immutable political ideology is Islamic. Yet we must study Soviet methods of development and modify them in the context of Islamic thought and practice. This is a task for our intellectuals who must work harder than ever to build up a structure of econo-

mic thought suited to our needs. A great deal of unfettered thinking and writing will be required for that. In his message to the Writers Guild meeting at Dacca, the President of Pakistan appealed to the writers of the nation in words that leave them no excuse for inactivity in the face of the nation's dire need: "Feel free in your mind, act freely in you expression and react freely to the environment around you. Let not the edge of your sensitivity be blunted by any sense of fear or expediency. On my behalf, I cannot do better than assure you in the spirit of Voltaire, that I may differ, even protest, against what you say but I will defend your right to say it unless it is directed against the very existence of our homeland."

Possible Objections:

This study of the Five-Year Plan would be incomplete if it did not discuss some of the objections which are commonly met by those who take the view that heavy industry, especially steel, should not be postponed any further. Some of these objections with answers are given below:

Objection 1: Granted that industry is the solution and steel the first step, but where are the means? The country lacks ore. The iron ore that there is, is of poor quality and there is not enough of it.

Answer: (a) Look at Japan. Japan imports all its ore and uses imported scrap. She was able to fight two wars and dominated the Pacific on the basis of this steel. Japanese steel made from imported ore and scrap is today selling in Germany.

(b) If the iron content of the ore is considerable, there should be a process which can extract

it. Presumably, similar ore is being used elsewhere for the production of iron and steel. It has never been said authoritatively that Pakistani ore cannot be used for the production of metal. Let Pakistani experts examine the ore again. For instance, let the Punjab University Department of Chemical Technology put patriotic chemists and metallurgists on the job and produce a report in the shortest possible time. Let the University of Peshawar study the problem with the speed and urgency which national interest demands. If foreign advice is necessary, it would be merely logical not to seek it from countries whose own interest demands that Pakistan and other underdeveloped countries should remain agricultural raw material producing regions and markets for their manufactured goods. If we have, in the past, sought such assistance, it has been an illogical mistake. The expediencies of the cold war have been ruthless and are ruthless still. We must recognise this fact and in the interest of our survival, subject all foreign advice to critical examination.

Objection 2: If Pakistan makes her own steel it will be expensive. Why should Pakistan not buy cheap steel elsewhere?

Answer: Why should Pakistani steel be expensive if Japanese steel made from imported ore is cheap enough to be carried round the world and sell in Germany which is the home of European steel? Our labour is as cheap if, indeed, not cheaper than Japanese labour. The only reason why our steel can be expensive is that we should pay too much for the foreign component and foreign experts who might work in a leisurely fashion. For the foreign component we should shop round the world and not be hustled into an expensive deal with the nearest sellers. India has found the

colossal foreign component at a low cost to herself for her Bhilai Steel Plan (Production: one million tons) from the Soviet Union.

Can Pakistan not do a little shopping of that kind? What has India lost? Is the U.S. less friendly to India? Has India not received from U.S. several times the aid received by Pakistan? These are logical questions. They pertain to realities. It is a reality that the First Five-Year Plan has not raised the national income. This means that we must recognise the reality of want, malnutrition disease and distress for tens of millions of Pakistanis. We must also recognise the reality that in the last ten years Britain and France have begun making nuclear bombs and missiles, India has begun making tanks, troop carriers and bomber planes; even Egypt has started making motor-trucks and buses, while Pakistan's chances of making a jeep are still far off.

Howsoever expensive Pakistani steel may be, it will still cost less than what Pakistan pays for her steel at present. Even though our production cost be Rs. 1,000/- per ton, it will be less than Rs. 30,000 per ton which we pay for steel in shape of motor vehicles and not very much less for colossal amounts of other machinery. Howsoever cheap imported steel may be, it cannot form a dependable base for the manufacture of machinery without which Pakistan cannot exist in the Iron Age.

Mechanisation:

Objection 3: Mechanisation of agriculture will bring unemployment and dsitress to the millions of agricultural workers in Pakistan.

Answer: To no region of the world has mechanisation brought unemployment so far.

Let alone mechanisation, even automation does not bring unemployment. In Britain today there is over-employment while the number of motor-cars, washing machines, telephones, etc., is the highest in the history of that country.

Mechanisation saves mankind from brutalissing labour and creates avenues for productive employment. If power-driven flour mills were withdrawn from the country and every household was to grind its corn every day with the hand-*chakki* would employment and production rise? Before the revolving steel fodder-cutter was introduced, every farmer owning a few heads of cattle had to keep awake long hours during the night cutting fodder with the old style chopper. Would the increased employment caused by the withdrawal of the revolving fodder cutter feed more mouths or lead to better livestock welfare or any other kind of gain?

The crying need of Pakistani agriculture is modernisation of implements. The wooden Persian wheel, the wooden bullock cart, the wooden sugar-cane press have an extremely low efficiency. These must be replaced with more modern metal tools. The problem of Pakistani agriculture is the problem of inefficient production. Irrigation, fertiliser, improved seed, in fact, every thing has been tried excepting modernisation of tools and has not made much diffierence. Why not attack agricultural inefficiency with modern implements? This for a country of the size of Pakistan can be done only if a steel and engineering industry is set up in the country. The first priority in agriculture ought to be engineering support for production processes.

Foreign aid is the dominant factor in the Plan. Considering that the aided development of

the past five years has not produced very successful results, we are obliged to modify the present posture of thought in respect of foreign aid.

They way foreign experts can influence the ventilation of thought and impartial judgment of objectives in the national interest is a subject the consideration of which will be especially rewarding.

Village-AID:

The extent of the usefulness of such aid as Village-AID must be assessed by weighing the gains in production, public morale and national spirit against the time and energy put in by the Government and the people.

The aid contributed to big irrigation projects will become productive when these projects are completed. Up to the present the money spent on them has increased inflation.

If, therefore, we pose ourselves the academic question: What will be the effect of the sudden and complete refusal by Pakistan of foreign aid on existing lines, the answer should not be very depressing.

English in Pakistan

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 19th & 20th April, 1960)

When a nation evolves, the expression of its government, which is the principal agency of its house-keeping should evolve also. New action needs new thought. New thought needs new vocabulary. This involves conferring new meanings on old words or even making new words. This can just not be done in a foreign language. Hence there is no example in history of a nation experiencing renaissance without emphasising its own language.

Try to deal with a new national problem in English. You will be held to be right if you use words in their old meanings and make the new problem appear an old problem. Deal with the same problem in the national language. You will be held to be right only if you mould the old words to fit the new situations. Hence to use a foreign language in national administration is to stagnate. To use the national language is to go forward. English, as used in our administrative set-up, has become stereotyped, rigid and devitalised. We cannot re-vitalise English for it is not ours to mould, change and invest with new meanings.

Set Sentences:

The official English as we know it comprises about a hundred or two hundred set sentences. Experienced clerks use these hundred odd sentences as well as high officers. In come cases they may even use them more plausibly. Small wonder then that administration has fallen into the hands of the clerks. Any one who tries to break through

this tiny microcosm of officialese embarrasses and disconcerts officialdom. They cannot accept a new thought pattern for they don't have the vocabulary for it. They cannot invent or adapt a vocabulary, for you cannot do that in a foreign language. So small is the scope for innovation permitted by the foregin language, that imagination and enterprise can find no room in it, If, therefore, an official is brilliant and competent, he will only make official mistakes. If he makes a special effort and increases his command of the foreign language in order to express himself, he will fail to carry others with him and his expression will be fruitless for it will not be understood. The only response that he will evoke is resentment at his initiative which will be interpretted as an effort to steal his superior's thunder.

For over a hundred years, English has been the instrument of foreign exploitation in this country. Its official vocabulary is associated with misrepresentation and repression. In free Pakistan we are asking public servants to work with the same de-natured and distorted foreign vocabulary. Should you be surprised if they are confused and do not know what they mean in earnest and what they still have to pretend? Let them work in the speech which they know and the people know and they can put words to new uses without consulting foreign authorities. They will then be new men, with initiative, sincerity and imagination.

Confusion:

No one is the willing enemy of his own people. "In due course" was often used when perfectly legitimate demands of the hour were to be shelved indefinitely for they were inconvenient to the foreign masters. Now when you use the same expression in good faith, are you surprised that

your functionary in this field and the public think you do not really want to do what you profess you will accomplish "in due course?" For a century "sedition or subversion" has really meant defending the interests of the exploited public. In the past "enforcement of law and order" meant terrorisation of sincere patriots, persecution of innocent persons, humiliation and dishonour for those who showed the spirits of independence. Today we use "enforcement of law and order" in all sincerity. How can we blame the people if they blench at the phrase, show signs of panic and behave as if that was the last thing they wanted? And can we really blame the police if some among them read the phrase as they have been taught to do for over a century? Don't we see? Why not speak to them in the language they know, and you know and I know? After all, why not?

"The masses" was an expression for the exploited part of the population from which the English-knowing reader or writer excluded himself. The continued use of these cliches results in confusion and misunderstanding, in frustration of the patriotic impulse, in evocation of the old hypnosis of slavery and finally in selfishness, materialism and cynicism among those who should be fired with patriotic zeal and self-sacrifice in the service of their motherland.

Intellectual Barrier:

English was introduced into this country as a process of empire intended to become an intellectual barrier between the people and their natural leaders, the middle class. As the native middle class increasingly adopted the foreign language, they became alienated from the mass of their countrymen who were

left leaderless. Before independence the British ruler wanted me to learn Englsih. I tried hard and learnt it but never so well as he. This suited him for before him I was nobody. He was the original; I was his awkward copy. He commanded in firm, confident tones and I signified my obedience in awkward phrases. I thought as he wanted me to think, for he gave me words which are the body of thought. These words were living things for him and yet obedient to his will for they were his by birthright. He could change them, mould them and twist them. For me they were lifeless idols, sacred and perfect, to be used according to the rules made by the master. I could not break them or mould them. I could only worship their perfection. The Englishman was the lord of his language and his thought. I became a slave to his language and the train-bearer of his thought. He could think freely; I could think only as he wanted me to.

And then I used my English to be different from my people. This put a wall between them and myself. This too suited the foreign ruler. My people did not understand me. When I spoke English at them, I did not want to be understood by them; I wanted to over-awe them. They did not understand me. They were over-awed. I did not need to think, so it did not bother me if I could not think in the foreign language. All this suited the foreign ruler. He gave me my thoughts for he gave me his language, the vessel in which thought is contained. He too did not want me to think on my own. The most tragic phase of this time-worn method of empire occurred when the English-knowing minority became the willing tools of the foreign ruler and sought to evade their own indentification with the national image. And by being imitations, they justly earned the master's contempt, for imitation is always

contemptible. Imitation is doomed to servitude, for while the original has the confidence and vitality of freedom, imitation is a trembling and anxious copy, obeying the impulses of another and never quite catching up with the original. It is the sad destiny of the imitator to be always falling short of his ideal, to be continually guilty of insufficiency and to live in perpetual dread of being named for what he really is.

Historical Chance:

This dire fate was imposed on us by historical chance for over a hundred years. During the tragic period of our political subjugation, the best among us were given over to the indignity of imitating the speech of the foreign ruler. They became shadows instead of being real men. They continually wavered and stumbled in their struggle with the alien language and appeared tongue-tied and dumb in the presence of their masters. Their highest excellence consisted in close imitation. They were barred from the exercise of originality, creative enterprise in expression and free adventure in the realm of thought. The foreign language descended like a blight on our fairest genius and smothered our best minds. What was said seemed hollow and spurious and we always waited in terror for the derisive laughter of those who were to the manner born.

A Deadweight:

More than a decade has passed since we acquired a home for ourselves and a name in the comity of nations. It would, however, seem that we are frightened of freedom and think that safety lies in dependence. We continue to own the foreign language and even ask foreigners to do our thinking for us. Today the foreign ruler has

gone and ended the era of his political domination. He has, however, maintained his economic domination because he withdrew peacefully and passed on power to a minority who by reason of their use of his language retained the mental habit of feeling safe only when they agreed *with* him. Consequently there is a tendency among the English-knowing class in Pakistan to turn to foreign experts in everything. How very injurious such extreme moral and intellectual dependence can be, will be apparent to anyone who studies the difference between the promise and achievement of the First Five-Year Plan and then looks at the Second Five-Year Plan. Such are the penalties of not recognising that a foreign language is a foreign language. In this world of grim and relentless competition, what chance of survival is there for an individual who invites another to do his thinking for him? Yet we have barred the doors on our own national genius by continuing to own a language which cannot but be a dead-weight, a remnant of an inglorious past. By retaining English we are shutting out myriads of lively and inventive minds from the councils of their own national concern.

The small minority among us, who at an immense sacrifice of time, energy and resources, have acquired a certain measure of English, are again in an unenviable predicament.

How many of our learned men, leaders and administrators wield the English language as an instrument of power, of adventure into untried experiments of thought, of eloquent and original exposition? Do they not live in constant fear of perpetrating mistakes of syntax and grammar—howlers which would wreck their argument and their dignity? How many leaders of public action do we have who light up the hidden corners of their

subject in irresistible English eloquence and inspire men to noble and heroic action? And if there indeed are such, how many are there who would understand them? Would their English eloquence inspire Pakistanis of whom less than one per cent have scaled the heights of proficiency in English connoted by the Matriculation examination?

Leaders speak to their followers to change their attitudes, to illuminate their minds, to yoke the mysterious powers of the emotions to the ends of survival. Our microscopic minority which devise English speeches are also the only people who can really understand them. For the mass of our people they have no meaning. Then what do we gain by these exercises? What abstruse and profound processes depend on this empty ritual? Yet we daily see responsible people reading out dead and lifeless harangues to equally dead and lifeless audiences. And when your local great man does try an English speech, is he not concerned more with avoiding a grammatical blunder rather than making a constructive point or giving a revealing analysis? Such a one is usually happy to be assured that the applause was not ironic and that the public responsibility has ended.

Dreary Mass:

Should we then be surprised that the sum total of our intellectual output in the English language is a dreary mass of generalities and sickening platitudes unrelated to anything in heaven or earth? Has the best skill of our best minds been reduced to an anxious exercise in avoidance of grammatical errors? Can a nation achieve a renaissance against such a background? Our experts are terrified at the idea of publishing a composition

which has not been doctored by some one who is moderately confident of his English grammar. Are we then justified in hoping for anything in these reports but a rehash of old banalities, evasions, compromises and hypocrisies forced on us by our erstwhile English masters in stereotyped English vocabulary?

In Education:

Our education has become a travesty of education because of the use of English. Our scholarship has withered and our men of learning have been exposed to the danger of inviting ridicule upon themselves for errors of language if they venture to descend in print. On one occasion, the present writer had the chance to hear an English missionary, a truly learned scholar of history, speaking to an audience in Urdu which he had painstakingly learnt over the course of several years. Following the common rule for Urdu feminine nouns, the learned historian fell into the error of speaking of a "hathi" as a feminine noun and said "*Porus ki hathi gir gai.*" The speaker who had acquired his Urdu at a famous British University, was greeted with gales of laughter and his scholarship was quite forgotten by the audience. Some ladies sitting next to me actually believed that the learned gentleman was trying to make a funny speech and kept laughing encouragingly during the remaining discourse. It then struck me that we had placed our own national learning and scholarship in a similar jeopardy by clinging to a foreign language.

Today tragically enough the sum total of our available fruits of learning is not considerable and the research in English which has appeared in print constantly borders on the ludicrous because of the perils of a foreign medium. Most of our

published works in English lack in lucidity and vitality, not to speak of originality. Generally the author's energies are, for the most part, wasted in an effort to cope with the problem of communication in a foreign medium. Hence if our thought is not free and bold, our intellectual initiative nonexistent, our writing uninspired and timid, our administrative documents stereotyped and unrelated to realities, we have to thank our own-selves for failing to adopt the national language for national purposes.

Usual Arguments:

In comparison with this disability which lies like a pall on the creative genius of our countrymen, the usual arguments in favour of English are pointless. That English is the language of diplomacy and commerce, that many books and journals are published in it, that it is easy to print English books, etc., etc., are irrelevant in the context of the awakening of the national intellect and spirit, of the upsurge of the national resolve, and of the achievement of national independence. English is the language of diplomacy but who gains by it? Surely those whose language it is. Others can only lose in diplomacy if they go out adventuring in a foreign language. It would be better far if we used our own language and hired translators. That is what all free non-English-speaking nations do. It is sometimes possible to have a diplomat who can be his own translator. But do we need to have a nation of translators, for some of them may one day be called upon to become diplomats?

English may be the most developed language with all the books of all the sciences in it, but these are for Englishmen. For Pakistan English is a blight that saps its life of the intellect and

the soul, that undermines Pakistanis' confidence in their own destiny, that stands like a wall between the people and their leaders, that smothers learning, that lays us open to misguidance and exploitation, that prevents the understanding of their problems by Pakistanis, and has become the means of perpetuation of the ills inherited by us from the days of our slavery.

Foreign Influence:

By indefinitely postponing the adoption of our national language we have laid ourselves open to being steered by foreigners. To cite an instance, our economic development is at every stage being influenced by outsiders in the interest of their own cold war strategy. Partly because of our working in English, the initiative has passed into the hands of foreign experts and we can do little about it for the foreign medium makes us incapable of innovation and independent thinking. They put phrases in our mounths and coin our slogans. The Second Plan is the blue-print of our national life for five years—a period which sufficed Hitler to change Germany from a beaten second rate Power into an industrial and military colossus ready to give battle to the entire world. Right in our own country, an identical plan *viz.* the First Five-Year Plan has failed. And yet there has been so little discussion on the Plan despite the President's invitation to the people to evaluate this all-important economic programme. One of the chief reasons for this is that the Plan and all its works are in English. Our advisers are English-speaking. What they say is linguistically correct and for us it also becomes economically correct. How can we in our faulty English profess to argue against those whose English must be faultless? The use of English undermines our ability to safeguard

our interests in economic dealings with those Englishspeaking people who are here to look after their own interests.

We must get our thinking clear with regard to the question of national language. If it is a universal fact, supported by the experience of national groups of mankind, that the use of national language is essential for the flowering of the national genius leading on to prosperity and strength, then real steps must be taken to make the adoption of the national language possible within a correctly anticipated period.

Barrier Must Go:

If the use of a foreign language in education and government leads to petrification of the national genius, to a weakening of national confidence, to frigidity and immobility of ideas, to alienation from the spirit of factual learning and inquiry, to continuous make-believe in the pursuit of truth, to proneness towards accepting foreign exploitation, to the mistaking of the means, which is proficiency in the foreign language, for the end which is grappling with factual problems, we must get rid of this disability. We must face the fact squarely, that by far the largest number of our men of learning remain hesitant, uncertain and shaky in the use of English to the end of their lives and their contribution to the achievement of the ends of education remains inconsiderable mainly for this reason.

There is something hollow, inadequate, undignified and spurious in our entire educational process at the university stage because the teacher or student with an unfailing command of English is a rarity. We shall fall into the most tragic error if we think that merely by paying lip-service

to the national language and continuing to embrace the foreign medium we shall come to any good. English is a barrier between our educated class and the mass of our people. At some stage this barrier should go and right from now we should start the process of thinning it down.

Our Five-Year Plans and Foreign Opinion

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 4th May, 1960)

It is only logical and essentially fair that the foreign Powers concerned with under-developed countries, should be primarily interested in the furtherance of their political objectives and in the success of their own moves in the cold war. We cannot really blame them if some of their moves serve their interests and do not serve ours. As a sovereign and independent people it is our own responsibility to look after our interest. It cannot be others' responsibility. Their responsibility is their own safety and survival, and in the world of today, it is a heavy responsibility, even for the strongest.

If, therefore, we fail to look after our own welfare, by the rules of the game, we shall deserve no pity if we lose. And a nation can lose a great deal if it cannot look after its interests. In all matters their interests and ours cannot be identical. It is even possible that in certain regards their interests may be opposed to ours. It is for us to know where this is so. They will be entirely within their rights to advocate their own view. We on the other hand will be within our rights in not accepting that view, and working from another standpoint which serves our national interest better.

We cannot, therefore, accept all foreign opinion. In judging the Plan, which in the blueprint of our income and expenditure, our saving and suffering, our weal and our woe, for five years, we must be especially careful in judging what

others say about it. This is a right given to all independent peoples by the tacit agreement of nations, and all free peoples use it to safeguard their interest.

Some Views:

Let us now proceed to examine what others say about our economy. I shall again quote here a statement made in the U.S. weekly magazine *Time*, about four months ago (December 21, 1959), and quoted by me in these columns on 10th January, 1960. "Out of a welter of confusion, inertia, committee meetings and high-minded oratory, three propositions last week seemed to be taking shape:

"That while the U.S. and Europe increasingly enjoy the good life, many nations outside the Communist bloc are getting more populous and relatively poorer. . . ."

Now let us see if Pakistan is one of those nations. When we made our First Plan, with the help of our foreign advisers, we expected our per capita income to rise by 7.5 per cent. At the end of the Plan period our per capita income had actually gone down. With the national income the case was similar. We had expected to increase foodgrain production by 9 per cent but there was no increase in food production. The number of workers is increasing faster than the jobs available in the country. Prices have risen, while salaries and wages have, with some exceptions, remained more or less the same. All this means much suffering for our people.

We may, therefore, justly say that Pakistan is one of the countries which is "outside the

Communist bloc" and which according to the *Time* magazine is, "getting relatively poorer."

Root of Wealth:

Under these circumstances we have to admit that our First Plan has failed. The Second Plan is so very like the First that it cannot be expected to succeed unless we alter it to include heavy industry which is the root and source of all modern wealth. We cannot unreservedly accept foreign approval of our economic policy such as is contained in the following Press report. "A.U.S. Government publication yesterday hailed the economic achievements of President Ayub Khan's Government in Pakistan and foresaw bright prospects for greater progress under its new Five-Year Plan" (*Pakistan Times*, April 17, 1960). It is a part of our weakness that we give wide publicity to these reports and do not analyse them. The nation's Press has a responsibility in this matter.

Let us analyse the above report. It is true that we have after the Revolution shown that we are viable. In a recent Press release, the Cabinet Secretariat invited wide discussion of every aspect of the Second Plan and clearly stated that no part of the Plan, not even the basic structure was unchangeable. This is a sure proof of our alertness and desire for independent action Now let us examine the Press report. It touches us in a sensitive spot and appeals to our pride in our leader. It is, therefore, likely that we might become less critical of the latter part of the statement which foresees "bright prospects for greater progress under its new Five-Year Plan."

The U.S. Agriculture Department who have released the above statement are completely within

their right in promoting the interest of their country. They also have the right to give their statement the form which makes it more acceptable to us. It is, however, our duty to see what is good for us. We alone can do it for no one else will do it for us.

Dangerous Error:

A suggestion which emerges from the above example is that we must not give undue weight to foreign praise or blame. It is clear that if a policy benefits us but does not benefit foreign Powers, they will not praise it. When they praise our Second Five-Year Plan, it is again clear that it is in their interest that it should stay as it is. But this does not prove that the Plan is also in our best economic interests. If, therefore, we believe our Plan to be good merely because foreign agencies praise it, we shall be falling into a logical error. In displaying foreign opinion of our economy in a manner which suggests that it is conclusive and unquestionable, our Press has fallen into the same logical error. Every day thousands of our educated citizens quote foreign opinion as though it were unquestionably true and thousands more accept it with the same uncritical attitude.

What is the reason for this widespread tendency among us to accept foreign opinion in a world dominated by competition and rivalry? One reason is the free operation of foreign publicity agencies on a very big scale. We have foreign missions, schools and colleges, libraries and reading rooms, journals and magazines, etc., etc., in large numbers in the country. All these numerous opinion-forming agencies belong to the Anglo-American bloc and have resulted in almost total acceptance of such concepts as "agricultural country," "need for foreign exchange," etc., without our pausing to consider whether these

expressions are subject to change. Actually our progress consists in ceasing to deserve these descriptive labels and epithets. Clearly we are likely to be confused if we start with these expressions as basic data and unquestionable presuppositions.

Communist Opinion:

The Communist bloc are opposed to the Anglo-American bloc in everything and seek to disprove their claims.,Clearly they would be very ready to point out the weaknesses of the Anglo-U.S. policy in under-developed countries. In view of the great opposition between the two world blocs, much of this criticism is likely to be exaggerated and useless from our point of view, but some of it might be helpful to us in understanding the real truth behind our relations with their opponents. We should, therefore, not shut out Communist criticism completely but subject it to searching, scrutiny and examination. It is universally true that a one-sided view of anything is likely to be defective. Our total rejection of the economic opinion of Communist countries on the one hand, and almost equally total acceptance of the views offered to us by capitalist countries on the other, is likly to give us a one-sided picture.

If we accept one of the two views with complete trust and reject the other with complete mistrust, without critically weighing each against the other, two results are likely to emerge. Firstly, our understanding of the real nature of our problem is likely to be defective, and secondly, we may not even be aware that a less defective solution is possible.

Positive Need:

There is great need for discussion of our development programme by our own thinkers.

The President has on several occasions invited discussion and the recent Cabinet Secretariat release has expressly called for it. It has to be admitted that comments on the Plan from independent Pakistani sources have been meagre. In substantial part this is due to the use of English which is understood by a small minority and used for free expression by an almost inconsiderable number. Partly this is due to a carry-over of pre-independence psychology which cannot still dissociate candid expression in the national interest from a feeling of insecurity and vague fear. This is most unfortunate. Let us, by an effort of logical analysis rationalise this fear. A little consideration will show that when a country becomes independent of foreign rule, the only real source of danger ceases to exist. Dictatorship or democracy, constitution or no constitution, Martial Law or any other law, are matters of detail when titanic issues of survival like a Five-Year Plan arise. To maintain silence in respect of such issues is to behave like a hypochondriac who is afraid of shadows, for he has undergone a terrible mental trauma in the past.

In the absence of discussion, the health of the whole undertaking is imperilled. Foreign opinion assumes prominence mainly because discussion within the country is almost non-existent. How can we have an independent policy if we can't even say what we want and what we think is good for us? And until we have an indepdnent policy how can we hope to become prosperous and strong?

Pakistan's Development Plans and Economic Realities

The class of persons who are, and should be concerned with Pakistan's developmental planning are Pakistani economists. Because of our past history, most of them have had their schooling in the thought-atmosphere of British economics.

The thought-atmosphere of British economics is the outcome of British needs and conditions. These are different from Pakistani needs and conditions. Pakistani planners using British economic vocabulary, consulting British reference books and being helped by British experts, are likely to assume that the inevitable needs of Britain are a part of universally given data and must be adjusted in all planning. This is likely to lead to wrong thinking from the start.

For over a century, Britain has been making machines and Pakistan has been growing land produce. Britain and Pakistan have been exchanging their goods on terms very, very unfavourable to Pakistan. Today, Pakistan has twice the population of Britain but there is more wealth in one British city than in the whole country of Pakistan. It is in the interest of Britain that the economic relationship leading to these conditions should continue. Britain is trying to achieve this through diplomacy, propaganda, aid, advice, trade, economic pressure, etc. In statecraft these are fair methods. Everyone uses them. It is on the other hand our right as a free and soveriegn country to refuse British aid, propaganda, advice and trade when it does not suit us. Britain has

grown rich by industry. We have grown poor by not having industry. This also means that the British are as strong as they are rich, and we are as weak as we are poor. People who are weak and poor are in great danger today.

Britain's Need:

Thinking, economic or any other, springs from facts. It is a fact that Britain needs agricultural raw material from abroad. Her own arable land cannot feed more than a fourth part of her population. Britain must import corn, cotton, leather and scores of other items of land produce. She just cannot carry on without doing that. So Britain does not like that countries like Pakistan should have their own industry, for if Pakistan has her own industry she will not buy British machines and will not send out her tea and cotton and jute to Britain in exchange. In the meanwhile Pakistan continues to be terribly poor. Almost half her babies die before they are six months old. Millions in Pakistan are underfed, ill and obliged to engage in brutalising labour. But this is no concern of any outside Power. Their concern is their own welfare and quite rightly too. We Pakistanis cannot in fairness blame other people for looking after their own interests.

According to some foreign economists, Pakistan must remain "an agricultural country." If we accept this expression it will mean that we must go on growing cotton and jute and tea and oilseeds for ever. It will also mean that engines and rockets are not our business. But we cannot accept that for we want to live in a world of engines and rockets.

All-Pervasive:

British economic thinking pervades Pakistan. We have been immersed in it for a hundred years.

In smote us as a flood of talk and action about village uplift irrigation, canals, seed, manure, cattle-breeding, insect pests, *taqqavi*, soil, consolidation of land-holdings, rotation of crops, agriculturists and non-agriculturists, etc., etc., In the days of the British, this was all. There was nothing else. We lived in it. We lived by it. We read it, wrote it and dreamed it. It brought us much poverty, disease and hunger, but we were told that these ills were due to our being superstitious, lazy, conservative and lacking in ambition and integrity. It was unfair —and untrue. Today the limitation of thought contained in the phrase "agricultural country" has become organic to our concept of the universe. It is there as almost the limit of all possibility, in our Government, our education, our health organisation, in fact in everything that is ours. It entered our First Five-Year Plan in protean shapes and excluded almost everything else. The outline of our second Plan shows that it threatens to engulf our future.

For five years, when China and India were being hustled into the modern age and setting up gigantic blast furnaces and immense heavy engineering, heavy electrical and heavy chemical plants, we were working out our First Plan which contained FIFTY agricultural schemes with titles like "Reclamation of land for boro cultivation on both sides of Sylhet Trunk Road" and "Improvement of marketing and flaying and curing of hides and skins in former N.W.F.P." At the end of five years we emerged worse off than before inasmuch as our per capita income fell, our food production figures remained where they were, and inflation gripped us.

We have made another Five-Year Plan on exactly the same lines. Five precious years and

hard-won resources had been wasted without bringing us a whit nearer to basic and heavy industry which is the source and fountain-head of all wealth, power and production, including agricultural production. And now we seem prepared to repeat our mistakes all over again.

Soviet Aim:

It is interesting to note that nations at war with Britain attacked the weak spots of her economic strategy. In the two wars Germany built submarine fleets and attacked British shipping. In the cold war that grips the world today, the Soviet Union, is trying to undermine the strength of Britain and other N.A.T.O. countries of Western Europe by industrialising the countries which serve them as markets and raw material producing regions—a state of affairs from which India, Egypt, Afghanistan and Iraq have derived such spectacular advantages.

On the other hand, Britain and her allies are making every attempt to keep their agricultural hinterlands un-industrialised. The machinery of aids and assistance in the smaller countries is intended to put the entire accent on agriculture and allied superficial industry which takes them further and further on the path of dependence on basically industrialised countries. The feverish activity in Africa today is aimed at developing the fabulously rich African lands as supporting agricultural areas for the burgeoning industrial and military activity of Western Europe. Anyone who looks at the complexion of British publicity can see familiar signs of the process of developing Africa as an agricultural hinterland.

Agricultural Complement :

In the Indo-Pakistan sub-continent the working out of the British economic strategy took the

form of development of roads and railways in order to take the raw material out, and the maximum emphasis on agriculture. Such measures as vast irrigation projects, elaborate agricultural schemes, revenue organisation, rural credit, village uplift, rotation of crops, pest control, cattle breeding, improvement in seed, conservation of cow-dung, soil improvement, etc., etc., and ultimately the division of population among agriculturists and non-agriculturists were the practical corollaries of the economic thought which for over a hundred years visualised these regions as agricultural complements of industrial Britain in a never-ending relationship of economic inter-dependence. Needless to say that this relationship resulted is one of the highest standards of living in the world for Britain on the one hand, and for one of the lowest for the fertile and populous Indo-Pakistan sub-continent on the other.

Such expressions as "agricultural country" and "industrial country" are uncritically accepted not only by the mass of our citizenry but also by far the largest number of our officials and intellectuals. Those who devised our Five-Year Plans seem to have taken for granted that basic industry like steel and heavy engineering must indefinitely continue to exist outside our frontiers and that whenever we need a truck or refrigerator or bicycle, we must beg, borrow or earn "foreign exchange."

Wrong Argument:

In the world of our economic thinking, trucks, lorries, radios, etc., which even Egypt has started making for herself, can be had only through "foreign exchange" which is obtained by growing cotton, jute and tea. When we are told that the prices of manufactured machinery have doubled in the last few years while the prices of our cotton

and jute have remained almost the same, we resort to foreign economic experts, and learn that all things considered, the best way for us would be to try to grow twice the amount of cotton and jute and tea. It is no business of theirs if that seems a hopeless task, without tractors and power-operated pumps. In the meanwhile all of us, educated and uneducated, high and low, officials and non-officials, stop short in our thinking at "earning foreign exchange" without asking ourselves whether anywhere in our plans there is a scheme by which that foreign exchange may one day take us an inch further on the path of real economic independence.

Today Pakistan does not have a normal economy. Actually it is the agricultural half of a complete economy, of which the other half lies in the industrial West. The crying need of Pakistan at Independence was the creation of an industrial base with power, steel, machine tools, heavy engineering and heavy chemicals, but our economic thinking, which was, in effect, British economic thinking, kept us in the agricultural groove. We continued to read and quote British economists and believed that we could postpone heavy industry indefinitely. When we shut out ventilation of economic thought from the Iron Curtain countries and looked at Soviet economic development through the mist of political and ideological controversy, our chances of understanding our real needs were still further reduced. Finally we more or less lost initiative when Anglo-American interests moved in, and brought short-term assistance subject to such conditions as did not permit the emergence of a real industrial infra-structure.

Paradoxes:

In the context of independent survival, our economic thought continues to be fraught with

contradictions and paradoxes. We use the terms "self-sustaining economy" and "agricultural country" simultaneously without realising that one is incompatible with the other. A self-generating economy is an integrated complex of basic industry and modern agriculture. What kind of a "self-generating economy" do we hope to build when we do not contemplate spending even I per cent of 1,900 crores (2nd Plan total) during the next five years on heavy engineering and steel? When we are told that India is contemplating an expenditure of 1,950 million pounds on industry and mining and 750 million pounds on power development (which means more than 33 per cent of the total of 7,500 million pounds for her Third Plan), we casually dismiss the information by saying "but conditions in Pakistan are different, you know."

An expression in our economic thinking widely in use, *viz*. "capital-output ratio" is applicable only to a balanced economy with agriculture and industry integrated in a just proportion. In the case of a lop-sided economy like Pakistan's, which moves in the groove of agriculture with primitive tools, the expression "capital-output ratio" is misleading. And indeed, although the makers of the 1st Five-Year Plan made a cautious estimate on the basis of a capital-output ratio of 3.5:1, the output on the 1,050 crores invested in the predominantly agricultural First Plan resulted in the enormous short fall of 100 crores in the anticipated output figure. The reason for this was that the mechanical component our our capital vestment was obtained from outside the country. The aid part of it was hedged in with delays, restrictions, reservations, omissions, publicity interests, and distorted the productivity of our own hard-won resources. In the complete and total absence of competition from the Soviets, it is not

logical to suppose that Anglo-U.S. aid can be divested of these disabling features. The only logical course possible to us is that we should reject aid and save our own considerable resources from being wrongly canalised through being mixed up with foreign aid.

Logical Error:

In view of the present complexion of our relations with the Soviet Union, our Anglo-American friends are likely to feel certain of our co-operation. Under these circumstances they are apt to make more conditions and press for more concessions in their aid policy. In India on the other hand, the Soviets are an ever-present and bold competitor for Indian goodwill. Consequently Anglo-U.S. aid to India is free from several restrictions, delays, postponements and is being given on the lines of Marshall Aid to Western Europe.

Thus the presupposition and preconceptions of British economic strategy are not relevant to our needs as a free and independent nation struggling to build up a self-generating economy so that we may have enough for the millions of our ill-fed and ill-cared for countrymen and may have a reasonable defensive strength in a world which is daily becoming less and less safe for ill-equipped and backward peoples. Thus when in our quest for economic independence, we quote British economic authorities in support of economic policies which we have arrived at with the help of British experts or their allies, the Americans, we are falling into a logical error. We must by an effort of logical analysis, perceive that a self-generating economy is a total economy and not merely an agricultural economy; that the millions of our countrymen are not condemned

by the Ordainor of Destinies, to be everlastingly growing cotton and jute and tea so that we may have a few thousand buses, trucks and planes on terms devised by other people; that every country is an agricultural country as well as an industrial country; that the time to mechanise our agriculture, in some degree, meet some of the needs of our transport and produce industrial raw materials for our small-scale industry, is now.

Under-developed Countries and the Global Cold War

(Reprinted from The Pakistan Times of 27th Oct. 1960.)

The cold war between the world's two greatest Powers, namely, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, overshadows the globe. All development, scientific progress and foreign relations in these two countries have become a factor of the colossal struggle which both antagonists dread, but against which both are preparing with a sleepless energy and with a mobilisation of resources and armaments which for their vastness and might are unparalleled in the annals of mankind.

The Great Two are preparing for the armed struggle, which millions hope and pray will never come, but which less optimistic students of history predict as being almost inevitable. An important aspect of this preparedness on the part of both America and Russia is the efforts of each to align other people of the world on their side. Lesser nations may be individually inferior in numbers or in resources but their collective potential for peace and war is so great that their affiliations with either of the contestants can have a decisive influence on the outcome of a global conflict.

Consequently feverish competition for the goodwill of smaller nations rages all over the world. The ways in which this competition manifests itself are bewildering in their variety. Each move in

the spheres of foreign policy, cultural activity, political propaganda, ideological proselytization, trade, aid, philanthrophy, social service, is, in the ultimate analysis, linked to the inexorable and ruthless needs of the cold war. The traders and industrialists journeying thousands of miles, the suave and untiring diplomats, the social service workers, the propagandists talking of the rights of man, liberty and freedom, the oppression of a regimented society or the exploitation of colonial rule, etc., are merely soldiers of the deadly war which the giant powers are waging for the inheritance of the earth.

Smaller nations are pushed about unceremoniously in this grim and essentially a-moral struggle for survival between the giants. The cold war is both their peril and their opportunity. The multitudious Chinese whose numbers exceed the combined populations of both U.S. and the U.S.S.R. have stepped into the Soviet fold and the U.S.S.R. has equipped and industrialised them on a scale for which the only existihg parallel is the colossal Marshall Aid to nations of Western Europe given by the United States after the holocaust of the Second World War. Marshall Aid to Western Europe and Soviet Aid to China are awe-inspiring phenomena by which about a billion human beings have been equipped with vast resources of power and prosperity.

The major regions where economic war is being fought out are India and Africa. With her 350 million population and great resources, India would be a valuable ally for either of the blocs. The U.S.S.R. has given India real and basic industry and solid infra-structure such as steel and thermo-nuclear power. A direct advantage to the Soviet Union accruing from the industrialisation of India is that she would become

economically independent and the NATO countries of Western Europe would be deprived of the mountains of raw material which the Indian millions produced and exported to support their burgeoning industrial and military production. While the Soviet Union is industrialising India to bring her usefulness to her NATO enemies to an end, the U.S.A. is trying to win Indian goodwill buy exporting tons of millions dollar worth of foodgrains to India so that the Indian millions who eat American wheat, maize and rice should think kindly of her.

Deprived of their vast markets and agricultural hinterlands in China, India and elsewhere (because the U.S.S.R. planted real and basic industry in these regions on a big scale) the countries of Western Europe and their American allies have turned to Africa. The fabulously rich Dark Continent with its millions of workers must be developed as an agricultural farm, otherwise the great prosperity, industry and military preparedness of Western Europe will wane for the want of agricultural produce. We therefore see that Africa and all things African are receiving the widest publicity in the Anglo-American Press. Unknown African chiefs have become world figures. Prime Ministers, Queens and Presidents are touring the African lands. African dignitaries are becoming the subjects of European biographers, photographs of African divines adorn the cover of famous American journals. From the urgency and the volume of this publicity, it seems obvious that the Soviet economic moves in India, China, Egypt and elsewhere urgently threaten to dry up the sources of supply of mountains of rubber, coffee, tea, sugar, wheat, rice, jute, cotton, oilseeds, hides and skins, et., etc., without which the most skilled European worker cannot but starve

and the best equipped European army cannot maintain itself.

Where does Pakistan come into this? Pakistan is a large country. With her 90 million population and tens of millions of acres of fertile arable land, she supplies hundreds of crores of rupees worth of vital agricultural produce to Britain, Japan, West Germany and other military allies of the United States. Clearly the inexorable cold war interest of the U.S. is to win Pakistan's goodwill without enabling her to install steel and other heavy industry with which she might become truly self-supporting and independent of her European allies. Students of U.S. aid to Pakistan can see for themselves the net results of Pak-American co-operation during the past decade and check up how far this logical reasoning is justified.

On the other hand, it is the logical cold war interest of the U.S.S.R. to enable Pakistan to become economically independent. Consequently it would be reasonable to suppose that Russian aid would be beneficial to Pakistan in precisely the sector in which American aid has missed her. Well-wishers of this country are, therefore, desirous that Pakistan should benefit from this juxtaposition of cold war forces and get Soviet aid in the sphere of minerals, heavy chemicals, heavy mechinery and ferrous and non-ferrous metals. Needless to say that such aid when it comes will be less for the love of Pakistan than for the fact that it will, in some measure, lead to economic weakness for Britain and other allies fo the United States. Precisely for the same reason United States' aid to Pakistan is less calculated to benefit Pakistan than to benefit the Powers which form the bulwark of anti-Soviet defence in Western Europe.

As has been said, the requirements of the cold war are inexorable, ruthless and know only of one morality—the morality of victory and survival. The great Powers have created potent agencies which manipulate trade, aid, publicity and diplomatic and military pressure. Government topple, revolutions are engineered, opposition parties set up overnight in scores of big and small countries, but all these processes of the cold war come to naught when faced with national resolve, solidarity and discipline. With faith in themselves and their destiny, with impregnable unity which overcomes provincial and sectarian jealousies and with disciplined support of their Government and their gifted leader, the people of Pakistan can win their share of prosperity and strength in the troubled climate of the cold war.

The greatest asset of Pakistan today in the context of the cold war is her stable Government which is founded on a deep loyalty and sense of national devotion of her ninety million citizens. Almost a decade after the death of the Quaid-e-Azam another leader of the first rank has appeared in Pakistan. F.M. Mohammad Ayub Khan has united his people with all the restless physical and mental energies of their race into a powerful force which can not only resist foreign exploitation but can make terms with those who manipulate the gigantic policies of the cold war.

Agricultural Prosperity

(Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 27th October, 1960)

One of the most important policies of our Revolutionary Regime was laid down by the President in his interview to a deputation of sugar-cane growers in Tando Muhammad Khan when he called upon cultivators in the country to resort in an increasing measure to mechanisation in farming. "The poor bullock has already done its job," the President said.

This is the first time in the history of our young country when mechanisation of agriculture has been authoritatively indicated as the policy we must pursue if our production has to catch up with our needs. The history of agricultural advancement all over the world unmistakably indicates mechanisation and modernisation of cultivation processes as the sole means by which figures of agricultural production have risen. Yet, curiously enough there is very little in the administrative tradition of our country which points the way to mechanisation of agriculture.

Intellectual Dependence:

On the contrary the pronouncements of agricultural authorities of the pre-Independence days all tend to make little of mechanisation, glorify coarse and inefficient manual labour and maintain the accent on breeding of draught cattle. So aggravated was the intellectual dependence of our English-educated intelligentisa that they never boldly questioned the anti-mechanisation agricultural policy of the British even when they learnt that agricultural production in this country was one of the lowest in the world.

Morally crushed and conquered, they treated the high yield figures of mechanised agricultural economies of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union as myth and fable to which they themselves could never approximate. Thousands of armchair agricultural economists who had hardly ever been beyond the octroi barriers of big cities, revenue officials taking their direction from British policy makers, village-up-lifters, *taqqavi* staff, social workers and other employees of the British imperial regime talked of high harvest yields in industrialised countries with the detachment of men telling fairy tales. They most unjustly laid the blame on the hard-working peasants, reconciled them to poverty and exploitation by emphasising their moral failings and left the impression that the misery of the peasants was owing to their sins. Many of these propagandists were genuinely misguided and believed what they said. Given to working in broken English, their thought never went beyond the circulars of the British Government. Junior officials, agricultural inspectors and overseers picked up the jargon of officialese and repeated it without comprehending the imperial policies which lay behind it. Cliches like "unemployment," "our wonderful manpower" "capital-shortage," "lack of foreign exchange" were bandied about by the half-educated who hung them like so many padlocks on the doors of reason and logic. Publicity through cattle-fairs, school books, public health agencies, veterinary services and every governmental agency kept the lay mind riveted on the pre-Iron Age agriculture and the virtues of cow-dung. Very few ever comprehended that these drives proceeded from the British need for cheaper and more plentiful raw material and that the basis of these policies lay in the requirements of British industry. Even today, when more than a decade has passed since we achieved freedom, there are many whose

only knowledge is derived from the British economic tradition and who in the face of overwhelming evidence from all over the world, continue to think of agricultural advancement without the power-operated pump, power-operated plough, and the motor-propelled wagon or truck.

There is not a single country in the world which has increased agricultural output without massive mechanisation and industrialisation. There is not a single country in the world to which mechanisation in agriculture, industry or any other department of life has brought poverty, under-production or unemployment. That in the face of these stupendous facts there should be people in this country who genuinely and sincerely believe that mechanisation is a minor issue calls for an attempt at understanding how such colossal misguidance has been achieved.

Imperial Mission:

The reasons lie in our history. For over a hundred years Britain farmed this country as a producer of raw material. This imperial mission called for the following:

1. Law and order so that ploughing, sowing and harvesting and carrying the produce to *mandis* should continue unhindered.
2. Building roads and railways to take the raw material out.
3. Promoting agriculture in all conceivable ways except one, *viz*. mechanisation.

This last reservation *i.e.* complete avoidance of mechanisation sprang from a simple logical fact. The governed countries should not be allowed to develop modern industry and engineering

which was the secret of European superiority. Even though mechanisaion would have helped to increase agricultural production, it could not be effected in any appreciable degree on the basis of imported machinery. To cultivate even five per cent of the arable land in the country by methods of mechanised farming would require a sizable steel, non-ferrous metal, heavy engineering and heavy chemical industry. This would amount to permitting the growth of a full-scale modern industrial complex in the country with the following results:

1. The colony would import less manufactured produce for basic industry would give rise to a multitudinous small-scale industry almost immediately.
2. It would begin using its own agricultural raw material to support its own industry.
3. It might actually start competing with the ruling power as exporter of manufactured produce to other markets.

We thus see that although it was in the interest of Britain to keep their Asian possessions agricultural, it was not in her interest to mechanise colonial agriculture.

In the late Indian Empire, therefore, a special economic philosophy and policy-measures based on that philosophy were propagated. These areas were described as "agricultural countries" and accordingly such measures as canals, elaborate land legislation, rural co-operatives, *taqqavi* loans, cattle breeding, soil conservation, anti-water-logging, horticulture, conservation of cow-dung, rotation of crops, etc., etc., were taken up on the largest imaginable scale. But what was carefully avoided was substitution of the wooden plough, the wooden Persian wheel, the wooden bullock

cart which were and are the most antediluvian and inefficient implements in use anywhere in the world. Consequently agricultural production, touched a law ceiling and never rose above that.

Groping for a Way Out:

This policy was enforced for over a hundred years and resulted in the growth of a gigantic administrative mechanism which drained out the wealth of this country. That mechanism is not quite abolished yet. Its main features and doctrinaire aspects are largely intact. Foreign agencies comprising diplomacy, aid, advice and publicity are trying to maintin the old foreign economic relationship. Trade figures show that Pakistan continues to be an important souce of raw material to Britain, West Germany and other N.A.T.O. countries. The U.S., therefore, cannot be expected to help in the real industrialisation of Pakistan.

Pakistan is groping for a way out of this economic labyrinth. If she pursues the path of mechanisation of agriculture and pursues it single-mindedly, she will break through to real economic independence and prosperity. If today we decide to cutivate a mere five per cent of our total arable land with three main agricultural aids *viz.* the power-pump, the tractor and the motor truck, and set up the mines, factories and workshops to be able to do that, we shall emerge into a new era of plenty and prosperity.

U. S. Foreign Policy and Pakistan

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 16th November, 1961*)

The American *Time* magazine is one of the most important spokesmen of the U.S. and is among the most widely circulated journals of the Western Bloc. The quotations that follow are taken from a single issue of this weekly, that of October 24, 1960 (Pacific Edition). Having stated that 'only four years ago' John Foster Dulles had called neutralism "an immoral and short-sighted conception," the *Time* magazine goes on to say:

"Today the U.S. position has radically changed. . . .President Eisenhower told the delegates of 15 new African nations: 'We do not urge —indeed we do not desire—that you should belong to one camp or the other'."

This must be stunning news for those Pakistanis who prior to the Revolution of October, 1958 had committed Pakistan so far on the side of the United States that they had seemed more American than the Americans themselves. Thus American students had been studying science at Moscow (and of course Indians, Egyptians, Afghans, Britons, Frenchmen and others) but no Pakistani student studied at the famed seats of scientific learning in the U.S.S.R. Russian dignitaries visited the U.S. and American leaders visited Russia. But hardly a Pakistani of note stepped across the common frontier into the Soviet Union. Delegations from all over the world including America went to the Warsaw Youth

Festival behind the Iron Curtain, but Pakistanis abstained.

The N.A.T.O. is the most formidable military organization of defence against the Soviets in the old world, yet almost all countries which were members of the N.A.T.O. signed cultural pacts with the U.S.S.R. Pakistan did not. Pakistan went far on the path of support to the U.S. and joined the U.S. Sponsored Baghdad Pact (the present CENTO) and SEATO which Russia looked upon as cold war hostility. Such instances could be cited indefinitely from the history of pre-Revolution Pakistan.

In the light of President Eisenhower's observation to 15 new nations: "We do not urge—indeed we do not desire—that you should belong to one camp or the other," Pakistan's pre-Revolution Foreign policy was to say the least, far from realistic. These instances of Pakistan's partisanship of the U.S. are extreme but they seem unimportant before the stupendous economic sacrifices made by Pakistan in the interest of U.S. economic strategy. We shall return to the subject later. At the moment we must see what the influential U.S. Weekly the *Time* magazine has to say in respect of neutralism.

Having quoted President Eisenhower, the *Time* proceeds to praise the Neutrals in incredibly pious words: "The neutralist nations have thrown themselves between the colossi of the East and West in the prayerful hope of ending the Cold War." Admiringly the journal proceeds: "They do not want to be pushed around by the great powers. The Big Five of neutralism—Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, Nkrumah of Ghana, Nasser of Egypt, Sukarno of Indonesia—are magnetic, colourful and messianic personalities."

The *Time* magazine even goes to the extent of suggesting the neutralism is historically an American idea: "The neutralism that the U.S. is learning to accept is of the sort the U.S. itself practiced during its early days as a nation: that beneficial isolation which relieves new countries of the risk of associating themselves with big power rivalries."

This is incredible but nevertheless true. The Pakistani reader who rubs his eyes upon reading this can turn to the 24th October issue of *Time* and see it for himself on page 23.

The question arises: What does the shift in U.S. foreign policy mean for Pakistan? The present is a terribly unsafe world. What happened Korea a few years ago, what is happening in Algeria, South Africa and Congo, what happened in Egypt shows that much can happen anywhere. We Pakistanis must carefully assess our position and coolly and dispassionately analyse where we stand and where do we go from here. In the memorable and beautiful words of President Ayub, "Self-knowledge remains for the nation, as for the individual, the first step in wisdom."

The following is a tentative analysis of our present situation.

1. We wasted the five years preceding the Revolution in a manner that it will require extremely hard work and very careful going to repair the damage. During this period we adopted economic policies which lead to the disastrous failure of the First Five-Year Plan. We did not make steel, machine tools, motors or other products of heavy engineering which are the means of prosperity in peace and sinews of strength in war. Month after month and year after year

we slaved to export mountains of agricultural raw material to the allies of the U.S. in Europe and Far East. This we did even at the expense of our food crops. Without our agricultural support the industrial prosperity and fighting strength of Britain, West Germany and Japan could never have risen to such heights as the present. We uncritically alllowed foreign Aid and guidance to steer us into economic failure in the interest of its own cold war strategy.

2. India did not accept Foreign guidance and Aid in the same way. While the U.S. was making every effort to keep Asian nations as agricultural supply bases for Western Europe and for that reason was trying to prevent the emergence of steel and other heavy industry in these parts, the U.S.S.R. was equally keen to do the opposite. Russians wanted to plant heavy industry in Asian countries so that they should not have to export their raw material to Western Europe for their daily needs. This would result in the economic weakening of Western Europe and consequently the military weakening of NATO. India profited by this. Russians set up a million ton steel mill in India on some of the cheapest terms on which such bargains have ever been made. The Russians also set up other vital basic industry plants in India. India leant so far towards Russia that merely in order to be able to stay in India, the Americans and their allies had to help India in what she wanted *viz.* steel.

We must recognise the fact that the ability of India to make 40 lac tons steel every year, sixty thousand cars annually tanks and aeroplanes, has upset the traditional balance of power between India and Pakistan. Thus, by remaining an agricultural supply base for America's friends, Pakistan has made the greatest sacrifice made

by any country of the world for another country during the past decade and a half. We are the fifth biggest nation of the world and in logistic terms, the magnitude of advantage to the Western block was colossal. We shall however, be unrealistic if we expect any gratitude from America or Western Europe for what in the light of todays events, must be regarded as our own lack of foresight. In fact, from the point of view the cold war, if Foreign agencies look upon our failure to acquire a real base for industry as a victory for their economic strategy, they have the right to do so.

3. President Kennedy's policy, given out in the carefully worded Reuter release of 13th December, "that India occupies in his mind a place of compelling priority" shows that such emotional attitudes as huff against India, because of her relations with the Soviets or past neutrality, or regard for Pakistan because of her loyalty have no place in the grim battle for survival. If Pakistan has impoverished herself to help the U.S., she must now take a realistic view of the situation. U.S. under Kennedy proposes to under write the food supply to Indias' 400 millions during the period of her Third Five-Year Plan. In her Third Plan, (contemporareous with our Second Five-Year Plan) India is expected to spend an astronomical 3,000 crores on Mining, Industry and Power.

We must see that the present policy of increasing independence in foreign affairs which is being followed by the Government of Pakistan is the only logical course of action left to Pakistan. In opening economic negotiation with the Soviet Union Pakistan is doing what she should have done ten years ago. We are not dismayed by foreign opposition to the steps taken by us. They

did the same by India and Egypt when these nations set about stopping foreign exploitation and putting their house in order. In fact in the case of Egypt they could not have done worse than what they tried to do. The hateful canard spread by the British "*Daily Express*" that Pakistan would give up her Eastern Wing in exchange for Kashmir is merely one of the moves which may be made by foreigners to create confusion among us. But we have proved our "faith, unity and discipline" and nothing can prevent us from exercising our sovereign independence and freedom.

Basic Development and the "Cost in Human Suffering"

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of* 14*th Feb.*, 1961)

Prof. Abdus Salam's address at the 13th All-Pakistan Science Conference at Dacca was most stimulating. By stating the fact that aid given to under-developed countries is almost all recovered in the shape of higher costs of industrial goods which these countries must import, Dr. Abdus Salam has made an important contribution to the understanding of the economic problem of this country. We are reminded of what President Sukarno of Indonesia said last year, "They give aid with one hand and take it away with the other."

One would, however, recommend a closer scrutiny of generalisation of Western economists to which Dr. Salam has referred in his learned discourse. I quote from the press report of his address:

> "Yet future historians will record that the fifth important lesson in economic transition to prosperity was taught by Pakistan in achieving a rate of growth as rapid as the Russian and the Chinese but without the corresponding cost in human suffering."

No doubt Dr. Salam had his own interpretation of this statement in his mind but I submit that the usual assumption made by Western economists when they criticise the Chinese pattern of economic development as being too costly in human suffering, is misleading and incorrect in

the context of our conditions. It is one of those generalisations which have been used to confuse our economic development in the past and we must analyse it coolly and objectively.

The entire history of human development proves conclusively that the only way to decrease human suffering is quick development of the foundations of productive capacity *viz.* steel, heavy engineering, heavy chemicals. Any other way is merely to draw out the agony of the millions.

If any other proof of this was lacking, the outcome of our First Five-Year Plan should leave no room for doubt. Our First Plan was based on the idea of going slow with real and basic industry. What was the outcome? We lost on all fronts. Our food production fell; our per capital income went down; the purchasing power of money went down; our dependence on imports increased. In short our First Plan was a signal failure.

This last statement covers a mass of human suffering which it is impossible to compute. While Pakistan was straining every nerve to grow cash crops to "earn foreign exchange," millions lacked food when food is taken to mean only cereal. What suffering could be greater than that of tens of millions of pale, under-nourished Pakistanis working with primitive tools to wrest a bare subsistence from the soil, suffering the rigors of our extreme climate and over and above that growing mountains of that raw material which was bought at tragically cheap prices by those who deplore the "cost in human suffering" of real and basic development. The child mortality figures for Pakistan are among the highest in the world. Surely there was suffering enough.

I submit that this suffering would not have been greater if instead of breaking stones for hundreds of miles of new roads which helped to take the raw material out, or instead of digging millions of cubic feet of earth in order to build irrigation-dams which would help to grow that raw material, a few lakhs of Pakistanis were engaged in setting up a steel mill, a machine tool factory, an iron-pipe factory and a motor truck factory. The foreign-exchange earnings of Pakistan were ample enough to set up some of these sources of the life-blood of an improving economy. Foreign aid was given on conditions which led to the waste of these resources in non-productive projects; in building ill-equipped hospitals for people whose main disease was malnutrition; in improving communications which led to more "trade" or the sending abroad of more and more raw material in exchange for less and less manufactured goods; in building extremely expensive fertiliser plants of which the utility was low for the country had few tube-wells, tractors and trucks; in building irrigation dams for non-mechanised and therefore uneconomic farming; in putting up extensive upper-class residential colonies for foreigners to rent, etc. etc. My submission is that the setting up of all these projects, entailed as much sacrifice in human suffering as a steel mill or motor plant would have done. Only there was nothing to show but an over-all fall in per-capita income for all this. If the same sacrifices had been made in the field of heavy industry, the returns would have been colossal and suffering would have rapidly diminished.

Let us now examine the same proposition stated in the positive form. The proposition becomes: "In a backward country superficial development gives rise to much more human suffering than real and basic development."

The truth of this postulate becomes clear if we examine a concrete model. What happens when we have to earn foreign exchange in order to buy a motor-truck or a few knitting machines or an X-ray plant? The answer is "We sell raw material." Now let us examine what poducing raw material really means. Suppose we earn a shilling of foreign exchange by selling a goat-skin. How is that goat-skin come by in our country? Some one grazes the goat and brings it up. He walks mostly barefoot on thorns, through mud and on sharp stones; drinks from puddles of muddy rain-water, is exposed to bitter cold and scorching sun. He eats dry bread, wears rags and has hardly ever seen an aspirin pill. After four years of this kind of living he rears ten goat-skins each of which fetches a shilling apiece of foreign exchange for his country. Tens of millions of Pakistanis who thus grow and collect cotton, jute, tea, leaf by leaf and stalk by stalk, earn foreign exchange penny by penny, yen by yen and mark by mark. Any development, therefore, does not bring that day closer which will end the need for earning foreign exchange for such stark necessities as trucks, rails, iron-pipe, tube-wells and tractors, therefore perpetuates human suffering to which our people are subject by their extreme want and poverty. On the other hand if the foreign exchange earned by selling this raw material was invested in steel, motor, iron-piping and other heavy industry, this human suffering would untimately be abolished as it has been without exception in each and every country which has built up heavy industry. We are obliged therefore to conclude that the assertion of Western economists that a major emphasis on the development of heavy industry and power (in the manner of China and the Soviet Union) involves a greater cost in human suffering is erro-

neous in the context of, and inapplicable to, the economy of Pakistan.

This last assertion is borne out by the example of Indian planning. The Indian Second Five-Year Plan which was contemporaneous with our First Plan, was, like the Chinese and Soviet development, based on steel and more steel, motor and other heavy industry. What was the outcome? While our per-capita income during the same period fell, the income of every one of the 350 million Indians rose by more than four per cent. The Indian example conclusively proves that rapid industrialisation from the base upwards is the only means of diminishing human suffering in a context such as ours. Any temporising or delay only increases human suffering. For over a hundred years we have been building road, bridges, offices, barracks, airfields, bungalows, railways and canals. Today we need to put every rupee in real foundational heavy industry. At the moment we are so situated that we need to build our trucks before we build any more roads, our prosperity before any more hotels, our planes before any more airfields, our guns before any more barracks, our tractors before any more irrigation canals. Planning means priorities, and today the priorities belong to steel, machine tools, heavy chemicals, motors and power. He who would build a house should begin with the foundations and the walls. If anyone persuades him to begin with the roof, he will never build at all and the suffering of wrong effort will be added to his suffering of deprivation.

Soviet Economic Competition in Pakistan

The Revolution in Pakistan has opened the doors for right thinking and right endeavour, In their numerous utterances the leaders of the Revolution have pointed the way in which the betterment of the nation lies. Speaking in Moscow, Pakistan Minister for Mineral Resources, Fuel and Power, Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto said that the Government of Pakistan has taken a decision to intensify competition in the field of oil exploration. Mr. Bhutto, who had journeyed to the U.S.S.R. to hold talks on Soviet Aid for Pakistan for exploration of oil in this country, said that he believed that the competition would help in producing more oil. Mr. Bhutto used the phrase: "Allowing more flowers to bloom" to explain the policy of introducing Soviet economic and technical competition in Pakistan.

To understand the great benefits that will accrue to the country from this policy of the Government of Pakistan we need to study the effects of this competition elsewhere. It will be remembered that the Soviet Union gave India the famous Bhilai Steel Plant (capacity ten lakh tons). Here is a quotation from U.S. Weekly *Time* (9th February, 1959, Pacific Edition) on how and on what terms the competitive Soviet Aid was given, and how the Soviet Experts worked and how they trained the Indians:

"Even Moscow's basic offer, a loan of 130 millions to be paid back over twelve years at a

mere $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ interest—has worked to its advantage.

"In Indian eyes, this makes the Bhilai project a business deal rather than an embarrassing 'gift' (since 1947 the U.S. has showered a whopping 1.75 billion on India in gifts, loans and credits). Furthermore, at cost to its own steel industry, the Soviet Union has been sending India its top talent. 'They have to be our best men,' said one Russian. You can say it is a matter of face. But we want this plant to work."

The Pakistani student of development will note the obvious advantages of Soviet competitive aid: Extremely cheap terms, almost a gift; regard for Indian national self-respect (instead of insisting that the aid should be advertised as a gift, the Soviets wanted it to appear a business deal); they wanted the plant to work and sent their top talent at the cost of their own steel industry. The U.S. Weekly *Time* goes on to say:

"If anything goes wrong, the engineers at Bhilai are in touch with the Kremlin by special radio within the hour. The Communists have guaranteed all the equipment they have sent and they have trianed 370 Indians in Russian mills. Soviet experts are under strict orders to let trainees handle as much machinery and press as many buttons as they wish. This does wonders for the confidence of young engineers, who say that in German factories they are treated like sight seers."

This evidence further goes to show that the Soviets competing for Indian goodwill were genuinely keen to save time, to train Indian egineers and to build up their confidence. They were anxious to score against the Germans in

in proving their desire to help and the Indians gained in consequence.

The American Weekly proceeds further: "Though the 854 Russian technicians have brought along their families to India, they employ no servants. They ride in buses instead of private cars or jeeps. The Russians work 16 hours a day, are careful never to mention politics. But the most effective Soviet ploy of all has been their insistence that every Russian of top rank must have his Indian counterpart. 'Here,' says one enthusiastic Indian at Bhilai, 'we work shoulder to shoulder with the Russians. Elsewhere, we work under the foreigners'."

This calls for cool and objective study and comparison. The foreign Russian competing for Indian goodwill lives a frugal, even an austere life, works sixteen hours a day and trains an equal Indian counterpart. In Pakistan where no Soviet competition was introduced by the Politicians' government, the foreign expert lived and worked very differently.

Here is a UPI report—(Washington, April 9, 1959). "The high living of U.S. International Co-operation Administration (I.C.A.) mission in Karachi has been sharply criticised by the U.S. Comptroller-General Joseph Campbell, according to the second section of the two-part congressional auditors' report made public yesterday.

"Mr. Campbell said his investigation showed an 'excessive' number of household furnishings and automobiles. Although there were only 271 Americans working there, auditors found they were equipped with 229 autos, 529 refrigerators, 650 stoves and 666 air conditioners all paid for by Government."

Here is an extract from a report by the Pakistani daily *Dawn* of August 19, 1958 entitled "Big Aid, Small Benefits—much waste through I.C.A. procedures—Top secret report on U.S. help to Pakistan. The Foreign Aid Review Committee appointed by the Minister for Finance. . . . has presented a very critical view of U.S. aid to Pakistan. . . .

"The utility of American aid is greatly reduced, the report indicated, by the conditions laid down for the purchase and transport of the material. It pointed out that while the purchases were generally permitted on a world-wide basis, specification of all equipment and supplies had to be written in U.S. standard and notice of all purchases has to be supplied to the U.S. office of Small Business etc. etc."

The report refers to "cumbersome procedure of aid," "inexperience" of some "technical experts" etc. etc. Incidentally, the system of guidance, controls and conditions instituted by the U.S. in giving Aid points to the measure of responsibility which ought to be assigned to foreign agencies for the disastrous failure of Pakistan's First Five-Year Plan. Today when the economies of almost every country in the world are booming, Pakistan is confronted with rising prices and scarcities. Our next-door neighbour India in which one of the biggest populations of the world is rapidly increasing, admitted and encouraged Soviet competition, and prosperity is surging up in India. According to the U.S. *Time* weekly, (January 20, 1961, Asia Edition), 1960 was "Best Year Ever" for India. Industrial production rose 15% and the "biggest rise in production was recorded by the automobile industry which turned out 52,115 vehicles in 1960," India produced

10 lakh bicycles and even exported some of them to its new markets in the Middle East. Beyond and behind all this lies the basic part that during 1960 India produced and consumed in its development over 20 lakh tons of finished steel besides pig iron.

It therefore becomes abundantly clear that the wise and far-sighted policy of our Revolutionary Regime in respect of introducing Soviet competition is calculated to further the best interests of the country in the shortest time with the least waste and delays.

The Soviets helped India in the really beneficial sector of steel, heavy industry and power. Little Soviet aid was given in the non-productive fields of buildings, bridges, hotels, less necessary highways, hospitals for people whose diseases are due to poor food, barracks, offices, bungalows and non-mechnised and therefore inefficient and uneconomic irrigation and agriculture.

The policy of the Government of Pakistan "of allowing many many flowers to bloom" will help responsible people in the country to understand the true nature of development. This will be the greatest gain. So far all development has been envisaged in the terms of growing raw material and building better and better roads, railways, ports and air-transport to take that raw material out. Soviet competition would have helped us not because they love us or our immutable Islamic ideology, but because it would have helped their global policy. We come across daily reports of agricultural failure, corn-shortage and the like in the Soviet Union. It means that 20 crore Russians are in difficulties about their agricultural needs. The question arises how are the agricultural product needs of 30 crore West

Europeans met? The NATO allies of the U.S. do not have one-tenth of the Soviet arable land. Where does their corn, cotton, tea, sugar, hides and skins, oilseeds, etc. come from? The obvious reply is from Asian and African "under-developed" countries.,We are obliged to conclude that the global economic policies of U.S. and its European allies cannot envisage a state of affairs in which vital agricultural supplies for their booming economies and ever-increasing military preparedness, should diminish. Aid from the Western quarter will therefore be most easily available for agriculture and transport, for dams, canals, roads, railways, airfields, ports, hotels, hopsitals, docks, communications, etc. But aid to basic development in the sphere of mines, minerals, steel, machine tools, motors and heavy chemicals is likely to be reluctant, delayed and expensive. Under these circumstances the policy of the Government of Pakistan of "allowing many flowers to bloom" is the only logical and realistic policy which Pakistan can follow.

The existing level of development in buildings, transport and communications urgently calls for heavy industry support. Further development in this direction will increase Pakistan's need for foreign imports which will be available only if she earns foreign exchange or in other words exports agricultural produce to the manufacturing countries of Western Europe. Besides roads, railways and communications directly help "trade" or the sending out of agricultural commodity and importing manufactured goods. This is the chief reason for Western support of such schemes. There is another powerful reason for Western Block agencies to encourage any kind of development other than heavy industry *viz.* that this development diverts the country's own resources from being utilised in basic and heavy industry.

The capability of a country to spend on development is limited. If this capability is consumed in building highways, rail-roads, university campuses, offices, barracks and light industry which uses imported raw material, the country will have no capability left for setting up steel, machine tools, motors and heavy chemicals which are the real sinews of economic independence and self-generating prosperity.

From considerations of global economic strategy which has compelling importance for the U.S., the NATO nations of Western Europe and Japan, it not likely that aid in the sphere of steel, machine tools and motors will be readily or quickly available from outside the Soviet Bloc. It is not an accident that the Soviets have set up a 10 lakh ton steel plant in India in less than half the time which has been taken by Western agencies to say that a small steel plant is "feasible" for Pakistan. The day Pakistan can build her trucks, tractors and machines which are used in small-scale industry, that very day she is going to put more land under food for her underfed millions and less land under cash crops which are exported for "earning foreign exchange." It would therefore be logical not to seek aid for heavy industry from the Western powers. In this field Soviet competition is likely to be of great benefit to Pakistan.

We therefore see that the policy of introducing Soviet economic competition which the Government of Pakistan has adopted, is under the present circumstances the most logical and beneficial course of action for the country. If in 1954 Pakistan had adopted the policy of "allowing more flowers to bloom" as Mr. Bhutto very picturesquely expressed the idea of ending the monopoly of the Western Bloc of powers, she

would, like India, have been producing her own steel and thousands of trucks, tractors and tube wells which would have changed the face of her economy and saved her millions from want and misery.

A Vision of Human Destiny

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 23rd March, 1961*)

Will the world, after a few decades, resemble the wreck of an astronomical collision, with debris of the work of man lying about in tragic desolation—a monument to human stupidity? Or, will the human race improve its terrestrial habitat to resemble an earthly paradise of leisure, plenty and be a platform for take-off into hithertofore undreamt of possibilities of the evolution of the spirit?

These are questions which no thinking man or woman anywhere in the world can afford to neglect or disclaim responsibility for answering. There can be no local loyalities for anyone anywhere, whether in the heart of equatorial Africa or the sophisticated environs of any of the world's great capitals, which can completely overshadow this abiding reality and awesome jeopardy for the children of Adam.

Since the volition for the choice between the great alternatives lies with men themselves, the question of the survival of our present-day civilisation remains a moral question. We have subdued our individual and tribal barbarisms to live in enlightened gregariousness on the national plane. Why can't men subdue their international self-seeking and barbarism to live in harmony and co-operation on the international plane? Those who believe that the struggle for human existence on our planet must take the form of all-out wars between human groups belie the promise of evolution achieved by man during the past thousand years.

As has been said, the question remains in its essence, a moral question, with the problem of justice between man and man at the very bottom of it. That such justice can emerge only as a consequence of the earthly omnipotence of a racial or territorial group of supermen, is to start on a dangerous presupposition. After all what will decide who are the supermen? War with nuclear weapons?

No, the growth of global morality must be the growth of a universal consciousness of the inviolability of the human image. This universal consciousness is not an idea which needs to be invented. It is present in the history of the race, in the emergence of great teachers and in the unbroken tradition of upward-looking and light, of the sanest and most responsible men of all ages.

If the tradition of universal rights of man was allowed to lapse by energetic and bellicose groups here and there, it does not imply that we cannot seek an unbroken continuity of that tradition with the responsibility and sanity which must belong to men armed with the ability to commit nuclear suicide.

One aspect of the problem of human survival is the aspect of justice to and rehabilitation of the world's under-privileged and under-developed groups. If we think that this justice can wait till we are sufficiently strong to enforce it, or to eliminate the rival that we do not like, we shall wait for ever—or rather the problem will end with the destruction of our present civilisation.

Justice to my less fortunate brother is not an act of charity which I shall undertake from a pinnacle of condescending benevolence, nor an

act of political expediency in my real game of power politics, nor as a means of proselytisation in favour of my narrow prejudices and household gods, nor with reservations due to my own surpassing excellence as a member of a group of supermen comparable to pedigree cattle. Human justice must be an act of humble duty, as a practical prayer to the eternal, indeed, as a measure of self-defence against the overtaking terrestrial Nemesis. And shall justice be interpretted as a shaking off of my superfluity of odds and ends? That is not justice. I must share my means of production, my thundering works of wealth, my mills and factories which dig forth sustenance from the bowels of our common heritage, the earth. For without these, my doling out of pittances cannot but be a prolongation of inequalities which piled high, will crash to a ruin which will envelop the entire race whose privileged groups could not distinguish between the mote and the beam.

Nuclear Opportunities:

Can I, while raising my eyes upwards and praying that the thunderbolts of wrath shall not fall upon me, not see down below wanton superfluity on the one hand and aching want on the other? Can I believe in the equal rights of the children of Adam on the one hand, and superficially apologise for the continents of want on the other? If I do that I give the lie to myself, indeed be a contradiction in Nature.

Let my assumption of moral height be borne out by my act and I shall be indestructible in a universe which is essentially moral. Let me be aware in intention as well as in fact, in faith as well as in practice, of the pressing rights of all those who like me were born of Eve, and I shall

survive. I shall inherit the promise of the opportunity which Nature has given me by revealing to me her secret which lies in the heart of every atom of matter. Let there be justice among men and the Nuclear Predicament will become the Nuclear Opportunity.

To come to the particular from the general, we Pakistanis by reason of our history and immutable Islamic ideology have associations with the world of Islam, the world of Christianity and the world od democracy. To the extent that we are a part of this world our economic backwardness is a part of its weakness. In the synthesis of all mankind which we hope will emerge, we are anxious to save the essentials of our way of life. We naturally look to our associated groups for support in this hope. These associations and expectations give us a claim on them. At the same time if this assocaion does not lead to the betterment of our economic condition, which is admittedly one of great poverty, our complaining to our associates is great. We have made and are making very great contributions to European and especially British prosperity. In asking for a fair deal we are not begging any favour. We are speaking from the proud vantage-point of the fifth largest national group which continues to supply mountains of absolutely necessary agricultural raw material to Europe and the Far East. Let there be no mistake about it. This raw material is being grown at great costs in human suffering by us and is being given away at prices which make it a gift far greater than any aid that we may have received from abroad. Can anyone then blame us if our disappointment with our continuing poverty is strongly felt and strongly expressed?

In the idiom of the universe which we share with our associates, an idiom which embraces the unity of man in the unity of God and establishes the dignity of man in his Vice-regency of the Almighty, we everlastingly accord our brethren an inviolable right in the scheme of things. But before that, let us have our rights which are manifestly ours and lacking which our very existence becomes an argument against the way of life which we hope to preserve.

In our way of life, freedom is the dominant note—freedom of the mind, freedom of expression and freedom of dissent or freedom to be different. The only way in which this element can be preserved is our practice of it. It is, of course, essential to practise this freedom within national boundaries, but it is even more essential that this freedom be carefully guarded when powerful nations deal with those that are less powerful. When small nations ask for the right to protest, to refuse to enter into disadvantageous economic and political bargains, let their rights be respected.

Strong-arm Methods:

In our concept of the way of life which we seek to preserve, we abhor such practices as the morning knock which takes away persons to disappearance without trial, or brigandage under the cover of diplomacy which "bumps off" dissent, difference and patriotic truculence. Let the Free World preserve its freedom and not make a mockery of it by adoption of strong-arm methods in dealing with smaller nations. The Big Powers, who are making efforts for preserving a way of life, should practise that way of life in dealing with small nations. Should any of them, or the responsible representatives of any of them, believe that they are ensuring the survival of freedom

and democracy by adopting strong-arm methods, by "getting tough," by resorting to "bumping off" dissenting patriots and unmanageable leaders of opinion, they shall have lost the battle for freedom and democracy before they have started fighting it. We believe that the way of life which they identify with freedom and democracy, is superior to the way of suppression and regimentation, conformity and coercion. We base our faith in the fact that freedom of expression which gives rise to difference and dissent will in turn bring the free society to higher stages of evolution, and in the vista of decades, leave all other coercive systems behind in the race of life. Viewed from this angle, the fiery zealots, the patriots and vociferous independents among small nations are precisely the men who are the medium and vehicle of the evolutionary processes of the Free World. If we have faith in the destiny of the Free World, let us cherish these individualists, these difficult and brilliant men who flout the Big Powers' policies with fearless word and open opposition. In shorter perspectives, they may seem difficult, obtuse, obstructive and even annoying, but they are the means by which the Free World is constantly correcting itself, reaffirming its primary values, adjusting its policies to the basic deeps of human nature and coming to the fruition of its untrammelled destiny. If a time should come when shades of darkness should seem to close in on the human race, it is these fiery and insuppressible monads, these brilliant individualists, these gifted bearers of the thunders of the pen and the spoken word, who will continue to sparkle in the growing night and hold the promise of another dawn of the human spirit.

The Straight Path:

Finally, there is the mystical dimension to our way of life which is an abiding reality, in our

belief, in the human scheme of things. This mystical reality has various denominational symbols, differing mythologies and manifests itself in an endless variety of supra-rational conduct. It is the mark of distinction of Man as distinguished from lesser creation. We don't believe that considerations of material efficiency, while they are not to be minimised can have such weight and importance, that men should place before themselves the ideal of efficiency, discipline and conformity as exemplified by a hive of bees or a colony of ants. The people of Pakistan who belong to the world of Islam believe that in the mystical dimension they have a contribution of universal importance to make in sharing with other men the recognition of an Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Beneficent and Just Purpose which envelopes the universe. This awareness we believe, is needed by all men to drive back the agencies of chaos and dark night. We Pakistanis work within the pale of reason and with the tools which our environment affords us. The foremost of these tools is the knowledge of Names which in current terminology is called Science. But in our mystical moments, the like of which, we believe come to all those who are born in the human image, we address ourselves to the Omnipresent and Omnipotent, Beneficent and Just Purpose, and leaving the agencies of our faculties aside as well as the limitations of matter, we say "Show us the straight Path; the Path of those on whom Thou sentest Thy blessings and not Thy wrath, and who go not astray."

Proposed New Priorities for the Second Five-Year Plan

(June 1960)

I. Creation of the basic infra structure in respect of mining, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, power, heavy engineering and heavy chemicals which have been neglected in the Six Year Plan and the First Five-Year Plan.

II. Increasing agricultural efficiency through engineering support to agriculture. The problem of Pakistani agriculture is the problem of efficiency and hardly any other.

If production-manpower ratio in agriculture in the U.S. be taken to be 100, the same ratio for Pakistan would be almost as low as 4. In other words, Pakistani agricultural labour is less than twentieth part as productive as American agricultural labour. The sole reason for the difference lies in mechanisation and engineering support to agriculture in the U.S. It is resaonable to suppose that if the level of mechanical support to agriculture in Pakistan became a mere 5% as effective as in the U.S., Pakistani food and other agricultural production would be doubled or trebled.

Higher priorities therefore must be accorded to:

1. Power-pump manufacture.
2. Tractor manufacture.
3. Motor-truck manufacture for agricultural transport.
4. Iron tubing and pipe manufacture.

Two Problems:

Two salient problems confront Pakistan. The first is the Indian threat to stop canal water and the other is water-logging. The proposed solution of the first, the Indus-Link Project, is gigantic, indefinite and not finalised in engineering terms. It will entail colossal digging with exactly what results to the economy, soil conditions, and what success, it is not easy to say. There has been very little detailed discussion of this colossal scheme.

The second problem *viz.,* water-logging is equally pressing. It is likely that to meet the situation in both these respects, ability to lift sub-soil water to the surface and use it for irrigation will be of very, very great importance. Consequently especially heavy priority should be given to diesel, kerosene, petrol and electric power-unit and pump manufacture. Manufacture of Iron tubing and piping should be another high agricultural priority.

Combating Waste:

Elimination of waste must be pursued as a positive project and given high priority. The First Plan was, like the Second Plan, an agricultural plan. The failure to increase agricultural output, despite extremely heavy expenditure on agriculture leads to the logical conclusion that most of the fifty agricultural schemes contemplated in the First Plan were wasteful. A wholly agricultural economy is lop-sided, and needs development of supporting heavy industry to balance it. Until real industry becomes operative in the country, agricultural schemes like most of those tried under the First Plan and contemplated under the Second

Plan are likely to be wasteful. The largest number of these schemes have foreign aid behind them. Someone offers us a dozen jeeps or books or apparatus or machinery. They also offer foreign trips to half a dozen Pakistanis in the name of training, and we adopt a scheme, which in real development priorities, has a third or fourth degree importance. Once we take it up, we-expend valuable time and resources of our own, which time and resources we should properly devote to objectives of greater importance. Our leaders make speeches and hold functions, our meagre Press gives space in its columns to these less important activities, our transport is cumbered with journeys connected with them, our officials leave their offices and undertake tours, our clerks draft circulars and send them round to the entire administration. All this expenditure from our limited resources in the end naturally bears little fruit, for right from the start the scheme was not really important to our purposes. When that happens we are frustrated. In all sincerity some of us blame our own selves for inefficiency, dishonesty, laziness. Others who put us initially on that path, quote just such utterances and help to depress our morale and self-confidence. In the end such aid brings us material and moral loss. Hence the point of view which welcomes all foreign aid, for it brings something into the country, is uncritical and not justified either by scientific analysis or by results.

Plan Estimates:

The Second Plan sets forth an expenditure of 1,900 crore during the next five years. Of this very big sum, Rs. 1,100 crore is to be found from domestic resources and Rs. 800 crore from foreign aid, loans and investment.

In view of what has been said regarding foreign aid, it would be reasonable to cut down

this figure to Rs. 400 crore and proceed with assumption of less aid.

Here is a Plan outlay on which further work may be done.

Mining and Industry	370 crore
Power	150 ,,
Transport and Communication	255 ,,
Agriculture and Irrigation ..	240 ,,
Village Aid and Basic Democracies	30 ,,
Housing, Health, Education and Social Welfare ..	320 ,,
Salvaging non-productive schemes of 1st Plan	30 ,,
Stocks and Miscellaneous ..	105 ,,
Total	1,500

Some Heavy Industry Targets:

Item	Capacity
Finished steel	5,00,000 tons
Pig Iron	10,00,000 tons
Machine tools	Rs. 10 crore value
Locomotives	100 Nos
Waggons	1,000 Nos
Tube-wells	10,000 Nos
Tractors	10,000 Nos
Diesel trucks	10,000 Nos
Automobiles	10,000 Nos
Soda ash	1,00,000 tons
Caustic soda	1,00,000 tons
Sulphuric acid	50,000 tons
etc., etc.	

Other targets to be devised in the usual course. These can be adapted from the existing plan. Light industry targets like production of bicycles, etc. should likewise be fixed.

Thoughts on Employment and Production

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 13th April, 1961*)

Employment in the national context does not merely mean keeping a person busy in doing something which he would not do if there was no pressure of need or fear on him. That is a superficial meaning. Let us go beyond it. It will help vastly if for doing our thinking we translate this word into our own language.

Employment, in the national context, should mean useful employment. It should be useful to the employed person and useful to the nation. 'Useful' is the key-word when thinking of national employment. In our thinking let us translate this word also into our own language.

So we should be concerned with 'usefulness' in quality and quantity of what we are doing (*i.e.* of employment), and not so much with whether everyone is doing something or not. (In real truth no one is actually unemployed. They are doing something and it is bringing them some gains in relaxation, experience, education, self-expression or spiritual fulfilment). Let us keep the word "useful" before us always.

Therefore it would be a wrong approach if we looked upon employment as (1) something unpleasant for the employed (2) something done by him because of want or fear (3) something which must be done at the cost of personal suffering. Viewed thus, if anyone thinking of manpower and employment says: "There are millions of lazy fellows among us who are only smoking *hookahs;*

they need to be driven;" that someone is losing the real direction of the problem which is 'usefulness.' For, if anyone is not usefully employed, driving them harder will lead to no gain from the point of view of their usefulness to the nation.

Tangled Thinking:

Things are complicated. They have many aspects. We can talk convincingly about any one aspect so long and so much that the others may be lost from view. It is most likely to happen in a foreign language. The big words, the high-sounding jargon, the air of authority of those whose language it really is, leaves us helpless. For instance we can talk about 'gains in happiness,' use words like 'optimum surplus,' 'fatigue-output curves' 'profit-motivation index' and get confused It is funny. I have invented these words just now, and when I look at them they even now look impressive.

The best way to avoid tangled thinking is to get the main direction and resolutely face that way. The main direction in the case of employment is indicated by the word "usefulness." Let us further look at "usefulness" and find the exact area of usefulness we are aiming at.

Usefulness can mean several things for us. Let us first determine what is the first priority in usefulness from the national viewpoint. Our trouble is poverty, which means shortages of all kinds. So 'usefulness' today means 'production' for us. Thus when we are thinking of employment and manpower, we should think with the help of such words as 'output,' 'production,' 'gain in wealth' etc. and less with the help of such words as 'laziness,' 'ignorance,' 'backwardness,' etc.

To repeat what has been said so far: Employment should mean 'productive employment'. The index of employment for purposes of national welfare is not the amount of time and attention spent by the employed person or the suffering undergone by him or her, but the output in terms of useful service or commodity.

An Example:

Now let us consider an example. Let us think of a man digging ground, for sowing, with a sharp stick. Consider this example well, for we are going to base our thinking on it. I have said that the ground has to be dug for sowing a crop. We employ a man to dig the ground and give him a sharp stick to do so.

We look at this instance of employment from our national standpoint of 'production.' From this standpoint, this man is not properly employed. He cannot dig properly. A sharp stick is not much good for digging. He would dig far better if he was given a spade. He would produce more.

So from the national point of view, the man digging ground with a sharp stick is not properly employed. We shall not call him under-employed, since that word leads to the incorrect thought that he would be fully employed if he would work more for longer hours. We shall call him mis-employed.

In the above example the person digging ground with a piece of stick is MIS-EMPLOYED.

In the case of mis-employment, increases in hours of work, intensity of application, etc. produces suffering, demoralisation and discontent. If a mis-employed person, like the man digging

ground with a stick, is exhorted, blamed and driven, he will suffer physically and morally.

A mis-employed person suffering from poverty owing to inability to increase production is liable to have his suffering aggravated by wrong diagnosis and remedies based on wrong diagnosis.

Wrong Diagnosis:

Instances of wrong diagnosis of mis-employment are (1) the employed person has a weak character, is lazy, lacking in ambition, old-fashioned, even dishonest etc. A person who seeks to cure his supposed weakness will demoralise and depress him and prevent the emergence of the true diagnosis *viz.*, that he needs the proper tools and implements.

(2) Instances of wrong remedy based in wrong diagnosis are that the mis-employed person's education should be improved. The correct approach would be that these factors, though in evidence, are not primary. The primary and basic factor is that his production of wealth (on which education, health, etc. depend) is poor for he is mechanically ill-equipped for digging on which the production of wealth depends.

By far the largest majority of Pakistan workers are agricultural workers. They are mis-employed for they are equipped with primitive tools.

The following are some instances of agricultural mis-employment:

(1) A bullock-cart driver. He and his family work day and night to feed and care for the bullocks. His wooden cart has primitive effi-

ciency. It is unwieldy, slow, prone to breakdowns. RESULT: Many people working hard to achieve a low production.

Subsidiary result: Poverty, ignorance and uselessness in group struggle.

Wrong remedy: Send him a social worker to talk to him about health, education, hard work and application etc.

Right remedy: Give him better tools before you, give him better education and advice. Give him a truck.

(2) A family hatching twenty chickens in a village without a big wire-netting cage. Half the chickens are picked up by kites and hawks, others get into crops, spread droppings and disease all over the village, get killed by cats, are chased every night by the whole family all over the place before they are cooped up. A case of marked mis-employment.

Wrong diagnosis and wrong remedy: Send a man for foreign-training on chicken nurture.

Right remedy: Manufacture wire-netting and sell it cheaply to villagers. Send them a teacher to tell them to make cages but "*produce the wire-netting first.*"

Wrong Foreign Aid: Send the village an X-ray machine to photograph the lungs of people who have become victims of infection spread by chickens.

Right Foreign Aid. Put up a big factory for drawing thousands of miles of wire and weaving it into wire netting for tens of thousands of villages.

Persian Wheel:

(3) A persian wheel worked by bullocks. A primitive, unwieldy, inefficient machine made of wood, rope and clay; produces a trickle of water which waters an acre with 24 hours' working day and night *i.e.*, two yokes of oxen needed and four men. Two to drive bulocks by constant application of the stick—a brutalising procedure for men maddened by going round and round for hours on end. Two more men to cut and chop fodder—hard labour if ever there was any. Two yokes of oxen consume in 24 hours four *maunds* of green fodder, one *maund* of *bhoosa* and 12 *seers* of grain—all worth 24 rupees. Add to it 10 rupees wages of four men and the cost comes to 32 rupees. This is without the cost of depreciation of bullocks, of which one will die in an average of six months. Add to it the interest on the cost of bullocks and depreciation and breakage of the persian wheel. All this expense and terrible labour will just cover an acre with two inches of water. Surely civilised man never made worse bargain in productional employment. On the other hand a 6" tube-well will irrigate the same land in one hour at a running cost of five rupees or total cost of ten rupees. In 24 hours a tube-well will irrigate 24 acres and introduce the all-important time factor gain in agriculture. The employment connoted by agriculture with persian wheel irrigation is an aggravated instance of mis-employment.

(4) Ploughing with bullocks. An acre of land is ploughed in six to seven hours (an exceptionally hard working day for a man) with bullocks.

COST: Eleven rupees on bullock feed plus five rupees wages of two men. (The other man chops fodder and looks after bullocks). Add depreciation of bullocks and implements as well

as interest on price of bullocks. To plough one acre one man has to walk on uneven ground for seven hours and covers a distance of severel miles, all the while keeping the ploughshare pressed down.

Compared with this, a 36 h.p. tractor will plough it in less than one hour at a total cost (running cost plus depreciation etc.) of rupees six only. The ploughman with bullocks is so exhausted with the hard work that he has no leisure for normal cleanliness or improvement of his surroundings. A good part of his earnings is lost through the need for maintaining bullocks. Obviously the Pakistani ploughman is a mis-employed person, from the standpoint of production.

The problem of agricultural mis-employment is of great importance to Pakistan. For really it is the problem of production. More production means that everybody can have more. And that is what we need today, for everybody does not have enough. So we may even be allowed to say that the problem of curing agricultural mis-employment is a problem of the greatest importance to Pakistan.

Now to solve a problem we first of all need knowledge. Almost all our knowledge originated abroad. It is other people's knowledge. We can use some of it, but we cannot use all of it, as we shall presently see.

There cannot be the same Economics for Western countries as for ourselves. They buy agricultural produce and we sell it. If a bargain is good for them, it may not be good for us. The favourable trade which brings them prosperity may be unfavourable for us. One proof that is it indeed so is that after a century of 'trade' they have gone where they are and we have come where we are.

Trade Promotion:

All their economics is promotion of this trade. Their books say this. Their banking, insurance, transportation, everything in fact, is for the furtherance of this trade. So if we read their economics and accept all of it, things will go on as they are. So we see that we must think up our own economics also.

This is not difficult. The big truths are simple. They are simply said and simply understood. To think up our own remedy for our agricultural mis-employment, we should go back to our first example of a man preparing ground for sowing, and digging it with no better tool than a sharp stick. It is clear that the remedy is to give him a spade. For our better understanding we may ask ourselves—why hasn't he been given a spade so far? Obviously there has been wrong thinking behind it, else he would have been given a spade much earlier.

Now when we look at our medieval plough and our Persian wheels made of unhewn trunks of trees, ropes and clay pots and then remember that we are in the 20th century, we are obliged to conclude that our thinking has not been quite what it should have been.

Wrong Approach:

It is not that we have not been giving attention to agriculture. From the greatest system of canals in the world to district fairs with such exhibits as turnips, carrots and corn, we have done everything to promote this agriculture—everything, that is except making tube-wells, tractors and trucks. The rest—better seed, better cattle-breeding, better rural credit, better roads,

better railways, village uplift, '*tacavi*' loans, soil improvement, irrigation dams, insect control, malaria control in villages, etc., etc.—we have done for a century. How was it that the mis-employment referred to in the case of a yoke of oxen working a creaking Persian wheel and producing a trickle of water, escaped our attention? Did we not see, that the bullock-driven '*gadda*' is a highly uneconomic agricultural transport?

And since these anomalies are still there before us, are we sure that wrong thinking is still not there in considerable strength among us?

For the last quarter of a century, we have made several desperate attempts to better our economy and every time we have ended up with buying more railway material, building more bridges, providing more agricultural advice and uplift, digging a few gigantic canals, floating grandiose schemes for soil survey, antiwater-logging, anti-erosion, fertiliser plants, education-for-production, leadership-for-production, credit corporations, etc., etc., till we spent all national resources and even borrowed from abroad. And all the while we never made a beginning towards manufacture within the country, of trucks, tube-wells, tractors, or iron-piping commensurate with the vast needs of the fifth biggest nation in the world? We spent about 1,200 crores during the First Plan period. Why didn't we spend a mere tenth part of it on steel, machine tools and motors?

Old Friend:

Now let us go back to our friend the farmer who is digging ground with a sharp stick. Suppose his total resources are ten rupees. Obviously the first thing he should do is to spend his ten rupees on a spade.

Suppose I say to him: "Look, have your soil surveyed. Spend two rupees of your own and I shall give you five rupees aid." His reply should be: "Thanks, but wait till I get my spade."

Again I say to him. "You have ten rupees. That is not much. Spend three rupees on better health which is the root of all. I shall give you another three rupees as aid. Spend another two rupees on improving your road and get five rupees aid from me for that. And bring some more of your excellent land under cultivation. Spend five rupees on that along with another ten from me as aid. Come, you need a shelter for your guests. Put up five rupees and I shall advance you another five as aid."

To all these generous suggestions, our hypothetical farmer should say: "Kind Sir, thank you very, very much. You have been kindness itself for a long, long time. Just now my first priority is a spade. I must have my spade first and then I will spend money on all the important things you have enumerated. Till I get my spade I am not spending more than what I have so far done on anything else. Any diversion of my resources —my money or energies or attention—towards anything but a spade will prolong my troubles and my suffering. Till I get my spade, I shall try to get on with the road, the medical assistance, the soil and the house that I have got myself during the last so many years of heart-breaking labour with this sharp stick. If you have any aid to give, give it to me for the spade. If your aid is not for the spade, permit me to postpone its acceptance till I have got my spade for, my good Sir, I will not be diverted from my purpose of getting myself a spade with the least loss of time."

Overall Remedy:

1. "What to do. Set up basic industry *i.e.*, steel manufacture, machine-tool manufacture,

iron-pipe and subsidiary industry like tube-well and truck manufacture at almost any cost.

2. "What not to do:" Postpone expending national resouces on expansion of railways, roads, hotels, airfields, offices, bungalows, inefficient and uneconomic expansion of agricultural colonies, very expensive hospitals and educational plants, till you have made a start in basic industry. We have, for over a century been doing just this and made the country an agricultural farm living on agricultural exports. Now our needs of products of heavy industry cannot be met by export earnings any longer. They are not likely to be so met in the future either. The manufacturing countries are putting every ounce of their surplus in war preparations and are raising prices that they charge from us day by day. This process is likely to continue. When, because of rising prices of machinery, one of their agricultural countries threatens to stop functioning, they pump in aid to keep it going but not such aid as will make it economically independent. So in our own interest, we should hold over all development, other than that which pertains to mines, steel works, motor works, machine tools, for such period till a minimum production in these regards is achieved.

“Bafflegab” in Pakistan

Sylvia Porter, the most widely-read American writer on business has a word for the confusing jargon of economics. She calls it “bafflegab” and fights it by calling a spade a spade instead of something like “mechanical leverage with power impact at one end and displacement output at the other.”

The *Time* magazine, which featured Sylvia Porter in its 28th Nov., 1960 issue (Pacific Edition) referring to the language of economics, says that the business sections of the Press “abounded in the dullest kind of copy: earnings reports, productive indexes, commodity prices and stock charts, most of it in the strange and mystifying currency of the market place: ‘economic parity,’ ‘discretionary income’ ‘price-earnings ratio,’ ‘net free reserves.’ “This ‘strange and mystifying’ language or ‘bafflegab’ is a hurdle in the way of understanding of economic matters. Economic “bafflegab” can be so forbidding that Sylvia Porter who simplifies and paraphrases this mystifying jargon has a potential readership exceeding 23 million. And it is not merely the common reader for whom Sylvia Porter caters. When she spoke at a meeting of Detroit’s Economic Club, the audience comprised “leading bankers, stock-and-bond men and captains of industry including a solid phalanx from the automotive world. Chrysler Chairman L.L. (“Tex”) Colbert, American Motors President George Romney, Edward N. Cole, General Manager of General Motors’ Chevrolet Division, and scores of others.”

Economic bafflegab evokes protests not only in America but also on the European side of the

Atlantic, the famous British journal, the Weekly *Economist* of Nov. 5, 1960, reviewed a Rand Research Study entitled Foreign Aid; on the Theory and Practice in Southern Asia by Charles Wolf and published by the Princeton University Press and Oxford University Press, in revealing terms. This publication is of particular interest to Pakistan for it deals with American aid to Pakistan itself. Says the *Economist*: "Foreign aid is a somewhat pretentious book, packed with obscurities, written indeed in the kind of academic jargon that is almost a private language—Dr. Wolf produces massive formulae, full of symbols representing such imponderables as 'the economic index of political vulnerability' and in the end signifying no more than Shakespeare's sound and fury. The amount of time and ingenuity that must have been expended on this section of the book is impressive, but the results are quite valueless as a guide to policy.

"Helpfully Dr. Wolf says in a footnote that 'those who are bothered by mathematical notations can ship them.' The trouble is that readers who take this advice will be left with precious little beyond complicated references to 'capability-worth parameters,' 'vulnerability functions' and heuristic use of models."

This is astounding commentary on a book which is a Rand Research Study by an author who served on President Eisenhower's Draper Committee on the military assistance programme. The book directly deals with aid to Southern Asia, including Pakistan. It is an example of the sources from which "expert guidance" comes to us in respect of foreign aid and has an extremely important effect on our economic life. It is no exaggeration to say that American aid and the

policies accompanying it have had a dominating and decisive effect and say in the matter of what has happened to us economically.

This raises a grave question for us. If economic jargon or 'bafflegab' is so much a hurdle in the path of understanding of the reality behind economic facts in the English-speaking world, how much more must it be so in Pakistan where the number of people who can use straightforward English with reasonable efficiency is less than one per cent. Of the extremely small English-proficient minority in Pakistan, how many can really get to the bottom of economic bafflegab? It is reasonable to suppose that the kind of bafflegab on American aid which a learned reviewer of books on the staff of the foremost economic journal in the English-speaking world finds baffling and confusing, will be baffling and confusing also for the majority of English-proficient Pakistanis. Only those Pakistanis can really get at the root of economic bafflegab pertaining to American aid who are superior in economic wisdom and mastery over English to the learned reviewer of economic books in the English *Economist*. It is logical to assume that there are not many such persons in Pakistan or any other country where English is a foreign language.

We can therefore conclude that much economic thought that we receive from abroad (and almost all new thought comes to a country working in a foreign language from the homelands of that language) is, to say the least, confusing and difficult to understand for most of us. It also follows that those who create economic bafflegab for consumption in Pakistan can so devise it that it should work out to their advantage

whether it works out to the advantage of Pakistan or not.

In the interest of our survival in an extremely tense and dangerous world we are obliged to be blunt and face the fact that economic bafflegab from foreign sources can lead to serious misguidance for us.

We must pursue this problem further. It is in our interest that we have a self-sufficient economy. It is in the interest of our Western allies that we have an agricultural economy. It is in our interest that we should make our own motor cars, trucks and trpctors and locomotives. It is in their interest that we buy these things from them and send them our agricultural produce.

Western Europe is in military alliance against the threat from the Soviet Union. Marshall aid has built up Western Europe as an arsenal of industry and armament. Western Europe needs agricultural produce. Pakistan is one of the countries which supplies this agricultural produce. American pursuation and aid has been directed towards maintaining this supply. Inasmuch as this interest has prevented real and baisc industrialisation in Pakistan, it has been America's gain. In so far as this interest has prevented real and basic industrialisation in Pakistan it has been Pakistan's loss.

Let us now consider this broad generalisation and see if it is justified by the facts. Let us take those facts which belong to the past so that they are known and there can be no doubt about them. For this purpose let us consider the promise and achievement of our First Five-Year Plan which began from 1955. This was a Plan heavily subsidised by aid subject to such conditions and

guidance as enabled the U.S. to have a dominant say in it. It was intended to raise the per capita income, national income, production of foreign exchange earnings and food crops. The nation's earnings and savings of five years were sunk in it.

Our advisers pursuaded us to give up steel-production and heavy engineering for the manufacture of tube-wells and tractors and instead led us into fifty other schemes based on fertilisers, improved seed, etc. with the result that again five years of wasteful and heart-breaking labour our total production fall and we made no progress whatever in from the point of view of basic development and considering the increased demand for imported material and machinery, we actually went backwards. Victims of Bafflegab contributed their share in bringing this about. Time and again, they said "Agriculture first, industry afterwards. We want food. We cannot eat steel." These quarters have failed to understand that agriculture requires tube-wells tractors, truck and iron-piping. Agriculture does not mean grabbing in the soil with bare hands.

Here it may be asked: We received hundreds of crores of rupees worth of foreign aid. Where did the aid go? Aid was so mcuh money from outside. By simple arithmetic, it should have resulted in everybody having more and being more prosperous. Why was there a fall in prosperity? If hundreds of croes of money and all the good and useful things it can buy came into the country, where are they?

As facts stand, there have nothing to show for this aid except a fall in per capita income, fall in foreign currency reserves, fall in the national income? The logical query should be: Are we sure that aid was indeed aid, and did if bring

something into the country? Or was it a means of taking something out. Let us dig behind bafflegab about aid.

When we analyse and examine our economic condition, we are engaged in a task that is of great importance to our survival. If a nation is poor and weak, they have the right to ask themselves why it is so and examine all possibilities. In the struggle for existence every national group has the right to analyse and examine why it is not as strong and prosperous as others.

And no blame to others. They have the right to look after their own interests. Their very existence is at stake. We understand that. They are justified in pushing forward their policies and spreading ideas favourable to them. But then we are also living in the same world. Our existence is at stake too. So we have a right to reject their moves, their publicity, their "trade offensives marked as aid" as their own journal the *London Economist* calls it.

Now let us analyse the *Economist's* phrase. How is aid a "trade-offensive?" This is so for aid is calculated (1) to promote the production and export of agriculture produce to the Western bloc and (2) to prevent real industrialisation and economic self-sufficiency so that "trade" or the exchange of huge quantitites of raw material for a few cars, radios, trucks, etc. should continue and Europe should remain ready to fight the Soviets.

Once we seize upon this big and basic fact, the numerous big and little features of aid fall into place. The overwhelming accent on non-mechanised agriculture, the safeguards to keep aid from flowing out into real developmental channels, the multiplicity of advisers who consumed about a

third part of aid and kept its expenditure in agriculture, transport and propaganda-impact grooves, the expenditure on providing tours, short term courses to scores of Pakistanis, etc., are all parts of a grand economic strategy which operates against us. The part of this strategy which is unfavourable to us is expressed in confusing language or "bafflegab."

We have suffered so much and lost so much besides five precious years in the period of the First Five-Year Plan. We are now obliged to leave bafflegab aside and look for the connecting links between aid and increasing poverty. If someone says: Your poverty would have been greater had their been no aid, the answer would be "No." We did not fight a war. We worked hard in peace and order, No other nation outside the orbit of Western aid became poorer. Look at India. India refused the kind of aid we got. The central theme of the Indian Plan of the same period was "Steel and more steel, motors, heavy industry, heavy chemicals." The central theme for our Plan was "non-mechanised agriculture, canals and superficial industry on the basis of imported stuff." The promoters of bafflegab said that India was sacrificing her millions that you would not eat steel. But what was the result? India's per capita income rose by more than 4 per cent. Ours fell. It was we who had sacrificed our millions and gained nothing in return. India increased her prosperity and gained a formidable base for modern development by producing 43 lakh tons of steel, 60 thousand cars, etc. in the year 1960.

We cannot escape the conclusion that aid and our increasing poverty are connected. The size of aid merely shows the great scale on which the process which resulted in our poverty was

carried on. Aid has made us poorer in two ways: (1) By generally inducing us to grow and export more jute, cotton, tea, etc. on fundamentally unfavourable terms which further worsened as the First Plan period progressed. (2) By wasting our own colossal resources and foreign exchange earnings through investment in superficial development projects and diverting our attention from real, basic development like mining, metals, machine tools and power.

During the First Plan period fifty (a large number) of agricultural schemes were implemented wholly or in part. Over 6,00,000 acres of new land was broken. What was the result at the end of five years! Production went down. The aid part of these schemes was augmented with hundreds of foreign experts and advisers. Are we to conclude that they did not anticipate what the result would be? It is not impossible, but it is more probable that they knew what they were about. Our doubt changes to certainty when we look at the schemes themselves. Not one of these schemes pertains to manufacture of tube-wells, tractors and farm trucks, without which, they must have known no real change in agricultural production can be made. They did not recommend the adoption of these absolutely necessary modern agricultural implements because it would bring heavy engineering and steel industries into the country. That is contrary to their interest which is drawing lakhs upon lakhs of tons of raw material month after month and year after year in exchange for a trickle of manufactured produce.

No amount of bafflegab can conceal the fact that the policies of our Western allies have resulted in our economic helplessness. The grand stream of aid and trade is a continuous process of our

impoverishment. There may be eddies and whirls here and there; it may appear that there is an upward flow but the ultimate result is the same. There may be some aid which may seem to bring as a little respite but there is other which takes out more than it brings in and prevents us from breaking through to real development which means steel and other heavy industry.

There is only one antidote to bafflegab *viz.* discussion based on commonsense. John Gunther in his "*Inside Russia Todays*" calls steel "the key to everything." (P. 409). Interested parties should not keep us from taking the straight path to steel with its necessary adjuncts of heavy engineering and power. We should dig into their bafflegab and understand their strategy and motives. We have the ore and we have the gas. Bafflegab stands between us and success. Once our steel starts pouring and our machine tools, locomotives, and cars start taking shape in the hands of our truly wonderful craftsmen and engineers, we will be prosperous and strong. It is true we need a little outide help. Luckily there are two competing shops in the world today. If one shopkeeper hems and haws, delays, tries to make us buy stuff other than that we want, we can buy at the other shop. But let bafflegab not prevent us from knowing what we really need and how best and soonest we can get it.

Employment Opportunities in Pakistan

(*Reprinted from the Pakistan Times of 1st Aug.*, 1961)

Our First Five-Year Plan covering the period 1955-60 was a failure. Our production fell; our per capita income went down. There was less of everything for everyone.

One of the results of the failure of the First Five-Year Plan was that there were fewer jobs for workers of all grades. The Plan had aimed at creating two million job opportunities. In a country with 90 million population, this was not very much, but it was something. A good bit of the up-coming labour force would have been employed if these jobs had been created. But there were losses and shortfalls on all sides and employment suffered.

This single fact, *viz.* that of there being fewer jobs and more seekers for those, is of great importance. For people who are concerned with what our grown-up and trained young men and women are going to do, no other question is more important than the question "Is there something for them to do?" In other words, are there jobs? If there are no jobs then all other considerations such as aptitude, intelligence, education, training, application etc., are of secondary relevance.

Here I can hear someone say: "What nonsense! How can there be nothing for a person to do? A young fellow with imagination, skill and resourcefulness will create employment for himself." I beg to submit that this kind of talk, with which all of us have now become familiar,

is not justified besides being very unjust to young people, who after years of training and upbringing, are looking for proper employment. Employment requires tools, raw materials, place of work, arrangements for disposing of produce, etc. These factors *viz.* tools, raw materials, disposal of produce etc. are the outcome of national policies and efforts. No individual, no matter how well-trained and gifted, can create these things. The entire nation, through organised effort, can alone create these factors. The individual worker can bring these to fruit, make a living for himself and make his contribution to national production. But before he can do so, he must be given a proper chance. He must be given a regular job of work.

To return to our theme. Every anxious parent, teacher or administrator who is concerned with what the young people in the nation are going to do after they leave school or college, must first of all see if there are enough jobs in the country. If there are not, then all efforts in other directions such as improving the worker through better training, better aptitude tests, better health etc, are not going to be of immediate help. It is common knowledge that thousands of skilled and trained Pakistanis have been obliged to find employment outside the country. Of these several hundreds are highly qualified engineers, geophysicists, chemists and other specialists. All the while Pakistan is importing foreign experts, two here and three there, with much publicity and no end of obligation to foreign quarters. What does this mean?

Specialists:

One thing is clear. There are not enough jobs in the country otherwise our own specialists

would not have gone out of the country in such large numbers. They could not find employment in the open market. The foreign specialist who comes is financed by foreigners and has his own point of view about his mission.

Consequently creation of job opportunities is a problem of prime importance for the country. It is a question which embraces almost all national activity. A study of this problem would extend into the spheres of trade, industry, development and finally the over-all grand design of national progress. Only brief reference can be made here to various aspects of the problem of creation of job opportunities.

The Approach:

We start with the datum that job opportunities, at the end of the First Five-Year Plan, are not what they should have been. Let us see how we have been looking at the problem so far and what change in our approach we should make.

By far the largest number of persons who discuss this problem, discuss it in terms of proper training of young people, employment exchanges, application, steadfastness of character, production of skills and the like. All this is very good. It is necessary but what is even more necessary is answering the question: Do those jobs for which we are trying to create fitness actually exist?

Yet this basic problem is rarely examined. Why should there be this general unwillingness to face this basic, this primary question?

The reasons lie in our history. For over 100 years of foreign rule we have been used to discussing this problem in superficial terms. The

foreigner subjected us to economic exploitation, and we were impoverished. Several ills flowed from foreign economic exploitation. One of these was extreme poverty and consequent unemployment. Whenever, in the days of foreign rule, we discussed unemployment, we could not say, "Look, people are unemployed because there are no jobs in which they can be employed. The foreign Government has made us growers of agricultural raw material which is taken away from us in exchange for a few trucks, locomotives, etc., which in their turn are used to transport that raw material out of the country. We get nothing for ourselves. Our chief national occupation, therefore, is unproductive for us. The only jobs that this process creates are of two kinds. (1) For the majority back-breaking labour on field and farm in exchange for which we cannot get two square meals and covering for our bodies. (2) For a very small minority better paid jobs connected with the organisation of this process of economic exploitation, *viz.* maintenance of law and order, organisation of transport and other services of the foreign Government. There is no third category of jobs, for the country is, to all intents and purposes, doing nothing else but growing agricultural raw material and sending it out almost free of cost to the homelands of the foreign master."

Secondary Factors:

It will be seen that in the days of foreign rule it was not possible to discuss unemployment in these terms. So we discussed the problems in different terms. We evaded the issue of foreign economic exploitation and spoke of secondary things. Instead of condemning the foreigner which was just but unsafe, we condemned ourselves which was very unjust but perfectly safe

and even brought us promotions and rewards. So we started off something like this: "In discussing the question of employment in this country, we must refer to the social and traditional as well as economic aspects. It must be confessed that in many ways we are still in the medieval age. We have to go far before we create in ourselves the scientific application, the devotion to a job of work, the appreciation of the factor of quality without which in these competitive times, no production is of any value. It is regrettable but nevertheless true that our workers lack the professional integrity of the foreign precision worker. Until we become honest as a nation, we cannot etc. etc." All this was unreal and amounted to an evasion of the real issue, but we exerted our skill to make it sound plausible. Those who succeeded in clouding the real issue of foreign exploitation in the most impressive verbiage earned rewards for competence and promotions for service to the state.

During a century of this kind of "thinking safe and talking safe," we drifted away from reality and evolved a tradition of "safe" thinking which was essentially wrong thinking. Now when we have emerged into independence and freedom, the old mental habits keep many of us in the old unrealistic grooves.

The century-old hypnosis of fear—the fear of truth, the fear of recognising our losses, the fear of laying the blame where it properly belongs—still haunts our thinking. Our economy still continues to be what it was before Pakistan became independent. Foreign interests are influencing our thinking. Foreign aid has been given in a manner as to prevent us from canalising our huge resources into mines, minerals and

heavy engineering industry which alone can create new avenues of employment. Our revolutionary Government is making all efforts to establish sound thinking in the country and change the old lines of thought, but it will take some time to remove the old inertia.

The failure of the First Five-Year Plan to create new job opportunities was a part of its over-all failure to improve our economic condition. As in the pre-Independence days, our chief national activity continues to be growing jute, cotton, hides and skins, wool and tea for the foreigner and selling it to him at absurdly low prices. Even foreign quarters who benefit by this unfavourable trade cannot but admit it. A January 8, 1961 Washington release on the subject of a "New Deal to Less Developed States" refers to the prices that under-developed countries receive for their raw produce from industrialised countries as "rock-bottom" prices.

It stands to reason, therefore, that if a country's principal activity is producing raw material and selling it at rock-bottom prices, that country cannot hope to improve its economy. In other words that country must accept the fact of poverty for her millions indefinitely. It is inevitable that the largest number of jobs created in the country *viz*. the jobs of agricultural workers, should not earn them sufficient and balanced food not to speak of adequate clothing, shelter, education or medical aid.

Better Paid Jobs:

There is a very small number of better paid jobs in the country. What are these jobs? Can we increase their number? All these jobs are more or less of constant number and remuneration. In

the population of 10 crores they are under 10 lakhs or in other words these jobs are just for one man out of every hundred. For practical purposes their number must be treated as constant. Local variations as employing a few hundreds or even thousands in a new department financed by foreign aid is of no importance to the over-all picture of employment in the country.

But there is another, or third class of job which is remunerative and can be multiplied. This class of job is in industry. The root and base of all industry is steel and engineering industry which we lack and for which we have done almost nothing in the past decade. However, we have one big industry in the country—jute and cotton textiles. This industry produces valuable commodity or wealth and consequently it has provided numerous well-paid jobs to cotton and jute workers, transporters, distributors, wholesale and retail sellers etc. etc.

Small-scale Industry:

Lately we have emphasised "small-scale industry." This industry is dependent on steel, machinery, wire, chemicals, plastics, paints imported from abroad. To pay for the import of this raw material for small-scale industry, we again have to grow jute, cotton, wool, etc. and sell it at "rock-bottom" prices. Our pattern of imports cannot but be a shifting pattern. Today an item, like metal sheets or wire or chemicals, is freely imported and a small-scale industry comes up. Tomorrow for some reason we cannot import it and the industry shuts down, throwing every one out of employment, wasting capital investment, frittering away experience and skills gained. Employment connoted by small-scale industry can be significant only if it is based in

the products of mining, metallurgy, machine tools and chemicals produced by heavy industry within the country itself.

Today when there is a surplus of labour of all grades including the engineering grade which is the highest specialist grade, priorities in development must go to basic heavy industry which alone can absorb labour, or in other words, create new employment avenues. If we merely insist on training, improvement in the quality of labour, producing better-skilled workers, what will they do when there are just no new jobs in the country? Over a thousand engineers we produced have had to leave the country because we did not develop the mines, steel-works, machine tool and motor plants where they could have been employed. Engineers and skilled foremen are not employed by "small-scale industry" which produces things like watch-straps and fountain pens on the basis of a few thousand rupees worth of plastics, metal sheets and wire imported from abroad. Today the chief problem of Pakistan which might bring it relief from poverty and give it military strength is the immediate beginning of productive steel plants and productive nuclear reactors which produce energy (not experimental reactors in which money has to be spent), machine tool plants producing thousands of lathes, drills which make other machines (and not making of "parts" on demands); plants for the manufacture of heavy chemicals from which all other chemicals are derived.

In order to increase job opportunities we must have an expanding and self-generating economy, and towards that end we must set up our basic and heavy industry without further delay.

The Poet of Freedom

(*Reproduced from the Pakistan Times of 21st April*, 1961)

In considering Iqbal as the poet of freedom, we must assign the expression 'freedom' the widest connotation. Iqbal preached freedom for mankind from various points of view. He advocated the liberation of the human race from the bondage of superstition and ignorance and recommended that mankind own up the ideal of universal justice, equality and fair play. Iqbal used the Islamic metaphor in giving expression to this universal ideal.

Iqbal uses the word *momin* for designating the free individual. The *momin* has *iman* or faith, both intellectual and mystical, in a Beneficent, Just and Merciful Grand Purpose which envelops the universe. The *momin* understands the relationship of things and, as such, is truly wise. The *momin* is courageous in true speech and endeavour, for he knows his true place in the just and beneficent scheme of things. The biological purpose is subservient to the moral purpose. Hence the *momin* is contemptuous of animal fears in his mission of establishing justice and freedom among men or, in the beautiful and moving Islamic metaphor, in establishing the kingdom of God upon earth.

Want and Poverty:

The beauty of true endeavour is apparent in the conduct of the *momin*. Thus, when the largest mass of mankind is ground down by want and poverty, the *momin* lives the frugal life of one whose sense of justice forbids him wasteful luxury. The

momin then practises *faqr* or austerity of the proud and the strong, who are too devoted to the grand purpose of justice and peace among men to revel on the animal plane while their brethren suffer in want and poverty. Iqbal's *faqr* or austerity is distinguished from the drooling self-abasement and masochistic selfdenial of those who seek mortification of the self for its own sake. Iqbal, therefore, opposes *sadhuism* and monasticism which are contrary to the law of life or Islam;

اک فقر سے قوموں میں مسکینی و دلگیری
اک فقر سے کھلتے ہیں اسرار جہانگیری

The *momin* is free from the sense of animal compulsion which the modern man feels because of the spread of hedonism. The upsurge of hedonism in the last century has caused every individual to look at animal expression as the chief goal of individual effort. Everyone feels he must have more sex, more sunshine, more eating and drinking, more recreation, more display, more travelling, in fact, more of everything that an animal can desire. Iqbal condemns the current worship of this base and vulgar animalism above the duties laid upon the individual as the vicegerent of a beneficent and just God. When millions lack the barest means of subsistence, the worship of the hedonistic ideal and frantic efforts to obtain means of luxury is the worst kind of slavery. The proud, self-respecting individual then practises *faqr* or noble austerity which brings with it fearlessness in the assertion of truth and striving after universal justice.

Conception of 'Ishq' :

The *momin* is motivated by *ishq* or passion. Without the motivation of *ishq* man would be a

vegetable or a mineral. *Ishq* is the *elan vitale*, the smouldering urge to dynamism, the divine restlessness which urges the *momin* onwards towards the fulfilment of his destiny as the instrument of a just and beneficent purpose. Iqbal's *ishq* is more than the Freudian biological urge. Iqbal's *ishq* is supra-animal, supra-rational and wholly in consonance with the mysterious divine purpose. Reason is merely the mechanical rationalising of the mysterious urge. The urge itself is *ishq*, the driving force in the universe which is not merely material. *Ishq* transfigures the individual from a base worm grubbing for animal pleasures and miserable vanities to the shining sword of the just God, disdaining hypocrisy, proclaiming truth with fearless word and fighting all earthly odds in defence of the weak, the needy and the principle of righteousness.

The manifestations of *ishq* are awe-inspiring. They range from the armies of Islam engulfing empires based on organised slavery to the philosophy of Rumi and the science of Farabi. The symbolic lives of heroes flow from *ishq*.

صدق خلیل بھی ہے عشق ' صبر حسین بھی ہے عشق
معرکہ وجود میں بدر و حنین بھی ہے عشق

Climate of Moral Pride:

The free individual lives in a climate of moral pride. His *khudi* is again distinct from the sense of personal identity or egoism which is inseparable from biological existence. This *khudi* is the awareness of his weight and importance by the individual in a moral universe. The destiny of the universe, as far as it is relative to human existence, is determined by the action of the individual, who, identifying himself with the

true purpose, becomes an active agent of the battle of right against wrong. As a soldier of God, the individual is aware of his dignity and seeks his (or her) fulfilment in the field of righteousness. The individual's *khudi* saves him from being drawn into base compromise with evil or from a hankering after the flesh pots of immoral animality. The man or woman whose *khudi* is awakened, will not become an agent of exploiters nor permit injustice to be done.

Iqbal and the West:

As the poet of freedom, Iqbal opposed Western imperialism. He deplored the misery and poverty of the conquered millions of the East and protested against their exploitation by European nations. He sought a reawakening of the Eastern peoples and called upon Muslims to rebuild a just universal order on the basis of their religion of universal justice:

فریاد ز افرنگ و دلاویزی افرنگ
فریاد ز شیرینی و پرویزی افرنگ
عالم همه ویرانه از چنگیزی افرنگ
معمار حرم باز به تعمیر جهان خیز

Iqbal realised that the slavery of the Eastern nations sprang from their mental enslavement by European thought and philosophy. He constantly exhorted the youth of his country to rediscover the spirit of *hurriyat* in their own traditions. He was aware of the educational policies of the imperialist nations which sought to keep technology out of the conquered territories.

محکوم کے حق میں ہے یہی تربیت اچھی
موسیقی و صورت گری و علم نباتات

If any knowledge served the ends of imperialism, he condemned such knowledge:

هو اگر قوت فرعون کی در پردہ مرید
قوم کے حق میں ہے لعنت وہ کلیم اللہی

Perhaps no other poet of the modern times understood the oppressive nature of Western expansion so well as Iqbal. He fully understood that the basis of Western imperialism was economic gain and that European prosperity depended upon the deprivation of millions in the conquered territories of Asia and Africa. The relations between East and West devolved upon trade which was a continuous process of impoverishment of the governed peoples. If all other proof of the divinely-endowed insight of the great poet was lacking, his perspicacity in economic matters alone would show him to be a thinker of the highest order. The following quotation from *Bal-i-Jibreil* embodies a whole global philosophy of empire, trade and exploitation:

مشرق کے خداوند سفیدان فرنگی
مغرب کے خداوند درخشندہ فلزات
رعنائی تعمیر میں، رونق میں صفا میں
گرجوں سے کہیں بڑھ کے هیں بنکوں کے عمارات
ظاهر میں تجارت ہے حقیقت میں جؤا ہے
سود ایک کا لاکھوں کے لئے مرگ مفاجات
یہ علم یہ حکمت یہ تدبر یہ حکومت
پیتے هیں لہو دیتے هیں تعلیم مساوات
بیکاری و عریانی و میخواری و افلاس
کیا کم هیں فرلگی مدنیت کی فتوحات

Today, when Pakistan is seeking the culmination of her independence by building up her

prosperity and strength, the Pakistanis need the message of Iqbal more than ever before. The stresses of the global cold war are titanic, and as a subsidiary result, the educated classes in Pakistan are being subjected to a cascade of foreign propaganda which threatens to engulf their traditional values of universal justice, Islamic equality and objective appraisal of reality. Unless they can keep their independence of the intellect and the, spirit, the Pakistanis stand in the danger of being morally submerged in the ruthless propaganda war which is being waged with ever-increasing violence in the world. For this purpose it is necessary that we continuously draw strength and guidance from the greatest modern poet of the Eastern world who speaks to us in our language and whose clear message can help to save us from being blinded in the storm of hate, fear and unreason which rages over the world today.

Al Hamza, Pakistani scholar an patriot introduced himself to th reading public in 1941 when h Pakistan: "A Nation" was publisl ed by Sh. Muhammad Ashraf. Behir the pseudonym is a figure well know to the intellectual world as thinke writer, educationist and publ speaker.